Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Plant & Soil Science**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJPSS_104496**
Title of the Manuscript:	**EVALUATION OF SIDEROPHORE PRODUCTION BY DIFFERENT PROMISING MICROBIAL ISOLATES**
Type of the Article	**Research Article**

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(https://www.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's comment** *(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Compulsory REVISION comments **1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) **2. Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) **3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** **4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** **5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** **6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	**1. The manuscript is important for the scientific community; this is about siderophore production, which increases Iron. The study will benefit agriculture academics and farmers.** **2. The title adds an area of study that would be good.** **3. If continuing research or suggestions for applying the study results in the future, such as 1) substituting chemical fertilizers in agriculture. 2) The siderophore produced to increase iron uptake is most suitable for any crop and microorganism, and how much.** **4. Section summary and Conclusion should be combined and changed to Section Conclusion and Recommendations.** **5. The manuscript is scientifically correct.** **6. The reference list is not very up to date. The year of publication 2019 – 2023 should amount to 30% or more of the total reference list.**	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	O.K.	
Optional/General comments	1. The end of the last paragraph should add some benefits, such as the research results in producing fertilizers to replace chemical fertilizers in agriculture. What are the benefits of bioremediation, biosensors, and medicine? 2. Use the image on page 7 to assemble in the Material and Method section. 3. Fig. 1. Effect of different microbial agents on siderophore production, page 8 is to assemble in section Result and Discussion. 4. Lack of clear discussion, as reported by Ahemad and Kibret, 2014. What is the author's opinion? 5. Section summary and Conclusion should be combined and changed to Section Conclusion and Recommendations.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's comment** *(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Titiya Netwong**
Department, University & Country	**Suan Dusit University, Thailand**