

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_120757
Title of the Manuscript:	Response of chickpea (<i>Cicer arietinum</i> L.) to phosphate solubilizing microorganisms and phosphorus levels on nutrient availability, uptake and seed yield in inceptisol.
Type of the Article	Research 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://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 few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is important in the field of Agriculture, to avoid the effect of food poisoning caused by some group of microorganisms, such as <i>Aspergillus flavus</i> . However, the manuscript lacks adequate citations. The tables in the result section are not scientifically represented. Finally, some of the references are too old, and not well written.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It is okay	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	It is comprehensive, but lacks a brief recommendation. Brief recommendation should be included	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Subsections are not clearly presented. The author didn't clearly explain the methodology section.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientific and technically robust because, it investigated the effect of microorganisms in reducing the phosphorus uptake by the Chickpea plant. This plant is a major source of income in the study area, and the phosphorus plays a significant role in the growth and development of the plant. Therefore, its depletion in the soil may cause damage to the plant, and in return the yield will reduce drastically. Moreover, these microorganisms may serve as a source foodborne infection and intoxication. The manuscript contains some errors in both methodology and result sections	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	The references are not sufficient, and many of them are outdated. References not well written, and too old	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, it is Language is okay	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript is publishable after effecting all the corrections indicated.	

Review Form 3

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abubakar Sunusi Adam
Department, University & Country	Federal University Dutsin-Ma, Nigeria