

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_82986
Title of the Manuscript:	Response of 1-Aminocyclopropane-1-carboxylic acid containing <i>Pseudomonas fluorescens</i> for rhizobial population and yield of Maize (<i>Zea mays</i> L.)
Type of the Article	Original 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://www.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The language and grammar of the manuscript have ample scope of improvement. 2. Thorough proofreading of the manuscript may help improve the quality of the presentation of the information. 3. Can two replications in an RBD factorial design give statistically valid results? 4. Please write in full while citing FUI/UFUI for the first time in the manuscript. Afterwards, you can continue with the acronym. 5. Is there any need to air-dry the seed after their treatment with carbendazim? Was it a dry seed dressing or water was used to coat the seeds with the fungicide? The protocol may be referred to in order to ensure the validity of the methodology adopted. 6. Section 2.2: Seed inoculation...sowing: The last sentence (Soil samples...purpose) may be removed as the naming the method (serial dilution) makes it self explanatory. In the next paragraph of the section, please remove the anomaly of days and hours. How do 3-7 days correspond to 24-72 hours? 7. Page 6, Section Cob Plant¹: What do you mean by saying 30.6% response? Do you intend to say that this much is the increase over its respective control? If yes, this increase is not as much as 30.6 per cent. It is slightly over 28.5% upon calculation. Similar expressions elsewhere in the manuscript may be corrected or the formula to calculate it may be given in the methodology section. 8. Page 7, Section Grain cob¹: In paragraph 2, consider the sentence, "A similar result...un-inoculated control.": Please provide the unit of K contents in grains and straw. 9. Singh (2012) has not been cited in the text of the manuscript. Remove it from the reference section, therefore. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> None of much significance. However the last sentence of the manuscript text "Very recently, we..." reveals the identity of the author(s) and seems to be a case of self-citation</p>	

Review Form 1.6

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jai P Rai
Department, University & Country	Banaras Hindu University, India