

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_126431
Title of the Manuscript:	IMPACT OF PLANT GROWTH-PROMOTING RHIZOBACTERIA ON THE INCIDENCE OF APHIDS (APHIS GOSSYPII) IN OKRA
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is of great importance to the scientific community as it addresses sustainable pest control through the use of plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR) in okra cultivation. Instead of relying on chemical pesticides, this research presents an ecological alternative that not only reduces aphid incidence but also strengthens the biochemical defenses of plants, promoting systemic resistance. This approach contributes to agricultural sustainability and offers long-term benefits, such as reducing environmental pollution and supporting biodiversity. The well-structured methodology and clear results make this study a valuable reference for future research in integrated pest management.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is suitable. It accurately reflects the main focus of the study.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is comprehensive and well structured, effectively summarizing the objectives, methodology, key findings, and implications of the study.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The organization follows a logical and coherent flow, with clearly defined sections for the introduction, materials and methods, results, discussion, and conclusion. This structure enhances readability and ensures that each part of the study is presented systematically, allowing readers to follow the research process and findings easily. No changes are needed.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. The experimental design is well structured, utilizing appropriate controls and replications to ensure reliable and valid results. The authors provide a comprehensive methodology for each PGPR treatment, detailing the procedures for both aphid incidence monitoring and biochemical analysis, which enhances the study's replicability. The statistical analysis is carefully applied to evaluate significant differences between treatments, and the results are clearly presented, supporting the study's conclusions about the effectiveness of PGPR in reducing aphid populations and enhancing plant defences.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and recent, covering relevant studies that support the background, methodology, and discussion of this research.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communication. The text is clear and well articulated, with scientific terminology used appropriately to convey the study's findings and methods.	
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 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jairo Mariel Cardenas
Department, University & Country	University of San Luis Potosi, Mexico