

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_117104
Title of the Manuscript:	CHITOSAN COATED IMMOBILIZED ALGAL CELLS AS PGPR ISOLATED FROM SOUTH GUJARAT
Type of the 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.journalajsspn.com/index.php/AJSSPN/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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The article entitled "CHITOSAN COATED IMMOBILIZED ALGAL CELLS AS PGPR ISOLATED FROM SOUTH GUJARAT", has fulfilled the terms and conditions from a research point of view, and the research results are useful for knowing the effect of immobilized algal cells as growth promoters to improve the quality and quantity of plants Leguminosae. 2. In my opinion, the title given to the article meets the case study researched, it just needs a little attention, namely it is best to avoid using abbreviations in the title. 3. Globally, the description presented in the abstract is good, only an explanation is needed from the statement "The result revealed that seeds treated with Chitosan treatment of algal beads (T1 and T3) it gave significant growth as compared to Control (T0). Carbon, Nitrogen and Phosphorous concentration was significantly increased in all treatment as compared to control whereas, Sulfur concentration was increased in control was also, significantly increased in all treatment compared to control.", because this statement has not clearly and specifically reflected the results obtained in. research in order to improve research results, it is best to use a percentage value to show the results of improving the good performance of the proposed method compared to other methods or previous research. 4. In my opinion, globally it is good. For the writing structure, please look again at the written structure that has been determined. 5. In my opinion, the manuscript written is scientifically appropriate 6. The references provided are good, you only need comparative references from research that has been carried out by other researchers to be able to determine the novelty of the research carried out. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Please check again as a whole, especially the writing structure, thank you</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Introductory Part: It would be better if the introduction section shows the steps or stages of the research which are described in the form of a flowchart or work flow. Show the novelty of the research you conducted, as well as its relationship to previous research.</p> <p>Conclusion: Provide a more structured and simpler description that shows that the results of the research carried out are useful. The statement in the conclusion is still too global and does not show a more specific statement of results from a process carried out in the research, such as the statement "In conclusion, the experimental findings suggest that the use of coated immobilized algal cells is significant for plant growth promoter. They could have "a positive impact on shoot length, root length, nutrient content, and Chlorophyll content of mung bean plants. However, the negative impact on Sulfur content needs further investigation.", it is best to use percentage values to show the superiority of the methods produced in the research process compared to with the results of observations from previous methods or the results of previous research.</p> <p>Thank You...</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Chairuddin
Department, University & Country	Indonesia