

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

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it explores eco-friendly alternatives for pest management in okra, a critical crop affected by aphid infestations. The study's focus on plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR), especially <i>Bacillus subtilis</i>, demonstrates a promising method to reduce aphid populations while minimizing reliance on chemical pesticides, which have environmental and health drawbacks. The findings contribute valuable insights into integrated pest management (IPM) practices, showing how PGPR can enhance plant defenses through biochemical mechanisms. I appreciate this manuscript for its practical implications in sustainable agriculture, supporting both pest control and crop health improvement.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The current title, "<i>Impact of Plant Growth-Promoting Rhizobacteria on the Incidence of Aphids (Aphis gossypii) in Okra</i>," is informative</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract is comprehensive, covering the study's aim, methods, results, and implications.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript's structure is generally appropriate and well-organized, covering essential sections such as the abstract, introduction, materials and methods, results, discussion, limitations, future perspectives, and conclusion. This structure follows standard scientific formats, allowing for clarity and logical flow.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound, given its systematic approach to evaluating the impact of plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR) on aphid populations in okra. The study employs a well-designed experimental setup with appropriate controls, using both untreated and chemical treatment groups for comparative purposes. Statistical analysis methods are carefully outlined, and data on aphid counts and biochemical changes are rigorously documented, supporting the reliability of the findings. Additionally, the use of established biochemical protocols and multiple PGPR strains enhances the study's validity, making the results relevant for practical applications in sustainable agriculture.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :</p>	<p>The references in this manuscript appear mostly sufficient, covering foundational studies on PGPR and insect pest management in okra. However, to strengthen the manuscript, a few recent references on the latest advancements in PGPR-based biocontrol strategies and integrated pest management (IPM) in agriculture could be valuable. Including more recent studies (within the last five years) that discuss the latest PGPR formulations or nanoformulations, PGPR-induced systemic resistance mechanisms, and field applications could enhance the relevance and timeliness of the manuscript.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

Review Form 3

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:	Zaheen Hasan
Department, University & Country	M.L.K.(P.G.) College, India