

ReviewForm3

JournalName:	MicrobiologyResearchJournalInternational
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_MRJI_120867
TitleoftheManuscript:	Roleofsoilmicrobiomeinenhancingcropproductivity,insightfrom recentstudy
TypeoftheArticle	ReviewArticle

PART1: ReviewComments

Compulsory REVISIONcomments	Reviewer'scomment	Author'sFeedback (Pleasecorrectthemanuscriptandhighlightthatpart inthemanuscript.Itismandatorythatauthorsshouldwritehis/herfeedback here)
Pleasewritefewsentencesregardingtheimportance of thismanuscriptforscientificcommunity.Whydoyou like(ordislike)thismanuscript?Minimum3-4 sentencesmayberequiredforthispart.		
Isthetitleofthearticlesuitable? (Ifnotpleasesuggestanalternativetitle)		
Istheabstractofthearticlecomprehensive?Doyou suggestaddition(ordeletion)of somepointsinthis section?Pleasewriteyoursuggestionshere.		
Are subsectionsandstructureofthemanuscript appropriate?		
Pleasewritefewsentencesregardingthescientific correctnessofthismanuscript.Whydothinkthatthis manuscriptisscientificallyrobustandtechnically sound?Minimum3-4sentencesmayberequiredfor thispart.		
Arethereferencesufficientandrecent?If youhave suggestionofadditionalreferences,pleasemention in thereviewform.		
Minor REVISIONcomments		
Is language/Englishqualityofthearticlesuitablefor scholarlycommunications?		

ReviewForm3

Optional/General comments

I consider that it is convenient to point out the intention and the effort that the authors make in wanting to make the manuscript and bring an experience to a research product, that is certainly valuable and recognized. I think it would be an interesting model to improve and clearly establish originality. Your work is interesting, written well, and organized. However, there are some comments that should be considered before publishing, in this way, the scientific quality of the manuscript would be improved. I suggest the authors update the bibliography, many of the citations are more than 15 years old, therefore I suggest adding recent references which address the issue in question. Suggested citations are for genuine scientific reasons that emphasize the current topic of study in context. Authors should consider the corrections suggested by the reviewers. In this way the postulated manuscript would be reasonably presented, fluent reading

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:	Jacob Pitti
Department, University & Country	University of Panama, Panama