

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCS_105304
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of phosphorus solubilizing bacteria in combination with poultry manure on soil health and sugarbeet productivity under arid climate
Type of the Article	Original 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.journalajrcs.com/index.php/AJRCS/editorial-policy>)

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Given the lack of bioorganic fertilizers, the sustainability of agricultural productivity is underthreat. In the current study, the authors have determined the effects of phosphorus solubilizing bacteria in combination with poultry manure on soil health and sugarbeet productivity under arid climate, and found that this is a promising and viable approach maximum productivity under changing environmental scenarios.</p> <p>The title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>The abstract of the article is comprehensive.</p> <p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>The manuscript sounds correct to me scientifically correct. However, it should be confirmed by the Journal's office.</p> <p>The references are sufficient; however, most of them are not from recent years.</p> <p>It is very difficult to compare the significance between different strains of phosphorus solubilizing bacteria on dry weight of shoot and root, and number of leaves per plant, and length of shoot and root of sugarbeet under pot experiment (Table 2), and similarly various groups in Tables 3-5) using different superscripts. It is advised to only keep those data which are not significant in the Tables, and the rest of them should be presented as bar diagrams, so it is easier for the readers to better understand and compare the differences between various experimental groups.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language and English quality need to be checked.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ravi P. Sahu
Department, University & Country	Wright State University, USA