

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_IJECC_118111
Title of the Manuscript:	Remediation of saline soils using halo-tolerant plant growth promoting rhizobacteria
Type of the Article	Review 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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript is important for scientific community, this paper examining the sources and effects of soil salinity, highlighting the intricate interplay between salinity and soil nutrients and its remediation. In the present review there are identified research gaps in understanding the metabolic pathways and strain selection of HT-PGPR, as well as their interactions with soil microbiota. 2. Yes, the title of the abstract is suitable. 3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. 5. The text is clear and easy to read. 6. The list of references is large and recently. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>At the reference list, some names of species are not italic. Please to correct. Examples:</p> <p>Reference 9: Aslam F, Ali B. Halotolerant bacterial diversity associated with Suaeda fruticosa (L.) forssk. improved growth of maize under salinity stress. Agronomy. 2018 Jul 28;8(8):131.</p> <p>Reference 24: Hnilickova H, Kraus K, Vachova P, Hnilicka F. Salinity stress affects photosynthesis, malondialdehyde formation, and proline content in Portulaca oleracea L. Plants. 2021 Apr 22;10(5):845.</p> <p>Reference 60: Suarez C, Cardinale M, Ratering S, Steffens D, Jung S, Montoya AM, Geissler-Plaum R, Schnell S. Plant growth-promoting effects of Hartmannibacter diazotrophicus on summer barley (Hordeum vulgare L.) under salt stress. Applied Soil Ecology. 2015 Nov 1;95:23-30.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Dumitru Gabriela
Department, University & Country	Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iasi, Romania