Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Plant & Soil Science**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJPSS_121727**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Impact of Bacterial Isolates on Phosphate Amendment Solubilization in Rice Cultivation on Acidic Soils**
Type of the Article	**Original Research 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** *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
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.	**I suggest the authors to include more cites of researchers in the field related to efficiency of phosphate solubilizing bacteria in the mineralisation of various phosphate amendments in rice cultivation on acidic soils worldwide and comparing that research with their discussion performed in their study. I strongly recommend the review of different literature scientific research. Moreover, I think the authors must expand their introduction, discussion, and conclusion sections accordingly with new literature review that might strengthen their investigation.**	
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. I think the manuscript is well written and has not typo or redaction errors.**	
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.	**I believe the manuscript is well written, introduction, methodology, results and discussion sections are accurate, although I think the authors should cite more articles of similar studies in order to better explained the results gathered in their work.**	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	**Yes, although I suggest the authors to cite more articles to strengthen their findings.**	
Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	**I think that English in this manuscript is well written all around the different sections of the manuscript.**	
Optional/General comments	**I suggest the authors cite more articles related with the methodology they performed; and latter get a better understanding of the conclusions they found in their manuscript, discussing them with more details.**	

Review Form 3

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Jorge Octavio Virues Delgadillo**
Department, University & Country	**Universidad Veracruzana, México**