

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_106377
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of plant growth promoting endophytic bacteria <i>Gluconacetobacter diazotrophicus</i>, on germination attributes and seedling growth of rice varieties under in vitro conditions.
Type of the 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)
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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? Yes, (Plant growth promoting microorganisms usually increase the soil fertility and productivity of plants and reduce the toxic impact of chemical nitrogen fertilizer. The role of <i>Gluconacetobacter diazotrophicus</i> on seed germination indices of fifteen rice varieties (<i>Oryza sativa</i> L.) and seedling growth under in vitro conditions was nicely addressed. 2. The title of the article is suitable. 3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive. 4. Subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. 5. The manuscript is scientifically correct. 6. The references are sufficient and recent. If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. The suggestions and comments on the right side of the original MS inserted and highlighted with red/green font color.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	suitable	
Optional/General comments	Nice work	

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)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Muhammad Shafiq
Department, University & Country	University of Karachi, Pakistan