

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_106439
Title of the Manuscript:	Quantification of Antimicrobial Compounds Produced by Lactic Acid Bacteria Isolated from pulses
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)
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. In general, the work has too few results and scientific rigor to be considered for publication 2. No, the title mentions quantification of antimicrobial products produced by lactic acid bacteria isolated from legumes, and what they present are measurements of cultures of some pathogenic species under different laboratory conditions, they never identify the compounds that are supposed to inhibit the bacterial growth. Neither do they identify the lactic acid bacterial species 3. No, initially it seems like a summary of your methodology, and of the few results shown 4. If it complies with the structure of a scientific article 5. 6. Yes, for the quality of the work presented	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No, writing, grammar and quoting and punctuation, are very basic	
Optional/General comments		

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bernardo Sachman Ruiz
Department, University & Country	INIFAP CENID, Mexico