

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_125581
Title of the Manuscript:	Invisible Allies: The Role of Endophytic Entomopathogenic Microbes in Insect Pest Control
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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>
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.	It is a very comprehensive review of the latest developments regarding control by endophytic microorganisms. It provides an overview of what exists and what is still needed on this topic.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes.	
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.	Yes.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, however, it is suggested to use the last paragraph of the text as the conclusion. This is indicated in the review.	
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.	Recent bibliographical citations. Well structured. It covers the basics on the topic.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes.	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Only include minor modifications.	

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?	<u><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></u>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Oscar Arath Grageda Cabrera
Department, University & Country	Instituto Nacional de Investigaciones Forestales, Agrícolas y Pecuarias, México