

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_114429
Title of the Manuscript:	Identification of endophytes and evaluation of their impact on growth of Chia (Salvia hispanica L.)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### 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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1- It is an important work and discoveries for researchers and the agricultures community with, no doubt, very important axes to develop</p> <p>2- The title isn't suitable. I suggest "<b>Isolation and identification of endophytic bacteria from the rhizosphere and roots of Chia plants Chia (Salvia hispanica L.) and investigation of their bioactivities.</b>"</p> <p>3- The abstract is very poorly worded, it doesn't present clearly the key findings</p> <p>4- The subsections and the structure are appropriate</p> <p>5- The manuscript is scientifically acceptable</p> <p>6- Many paragraphs and data are not referenced and the bibliography is not very rich</p> <p>7- The conclusion isn't strength, it doesn't present well the key findings</p> <p>8- The results must be represented either by text or a table but not both</p> <p>9- There's no final points in the conclusion that highlights future work and further investigation</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>The paper is well written, English is acceptable</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>Nadia Jaidane</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Sousse, Tunisia</b>