

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_112803</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Plant Growth Promoting Rhizobacteria for Sustainable Production of Sugarcane and Rice</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>1. Yes, the manuscript would be important for scientific community as it gives a brief knowledge about rhizobacteria and how it promotes the production of rice and sugarcane.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title is suitable and apt.</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive, precise and to the point.</p> <p>4. The author could have worked a bit more on the structure of the manuscript, as there were some areas where the alignment wasn't proper and justified.</p> <p>5. Yes, Manuscript is scientifically correct, and the author has used scientific terminologies and gave a good detail of the references.</p> <p>6. The references provided by the author are sufficient.</p> <p>The author has a good knowledge on the topic he wrote the article on. The information he provided using the scientific terminologies is scholarly. The manuscript would have been much impressive if the author could have worked a little more on sentence formation, punctuations. The use of numbers in the article is impressive but it could have been more eye catching if the author would have represented it in pictorial/graphical way. Providing good illustrations and flow certainty would have made the article masterly.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>1. I think the language quality in the article is suitable for scholarly communications after some minor modifications.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ruya Khan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Anubose Institute of Technology, India</b>