

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_105644
Title of the Manuscript:	Halotolerant plant probiotic bacterial isolates of mangrove soils of Chidambaram and Thanjavur
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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/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"> 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. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The subject is of scientific interest.</p> <p>The title is sustainable.</p> <p>The abstract is missing the methodology section.</p> <p>In the methodology section there are no references that support the development used, as well as the section for the discussion of results. There is no evidence of statistical treatment of the results.</p> <p>In the absence of a discussion of the results obtained, the structure is not correct and the results lack a comparison to determine their importance.</p> <p>The references used present an adequate number, however there are few recent ones, for which reason it would be requested to include more current ones.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language used is adequate for the publication of the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript requires attention to the observations indicated on this sheet and on the manuscript itself.</p>	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ma. Dolores Castañeda Antonio
Department, University & Country	Research Center in Microbiological Sciences, Meritorious Autonomous University of Puebla, Mexico