

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_100503
Title of the Manuscript:	In vitro screening of different rhizobacterial strains against egg hatching of rice root-knot nematode, Meloidogyne graminicola
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>)

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	 1. Yes, the it is important for scientific community because application of bio-agents for the management of agricultural pests are very important in order to reduces the use of chemical pesticides and replace them with environmentally friendly biological control approaches. 2. The title of the article is suitable with minor suggested changes if seem valid to the author. 3. Abstract of the article needs to be revised and enriched to make it more comprehensive as it does not reflect all the bio-agents and the key findings of the research. 4. The subsections and structure of the article is appropriate but the reviewer suggests that the results section should be separated from the discussion part to make them more attractive/interesting and comprehensive. 5. The manuscript is scientifically correct with some correction that is suggested by the reviewer in the main body of the article in the form of comments and track changes. 6. The given references are sufficient and recent while the reviewer suggests to reduce them by combining or deleting the unnecessary ones. Additional comments: Some spelling, grammatical and punctuation mistakes that are highlighted in the form of track changes/comments should be addressed by the author.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	 1. Yes, the language/English quality of the article is suitable scholarly communications with some minor requested changes and rephrasing of some paragraphs.	
Optional/General comments	N/A	

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)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Noor Ahmad Popal
Department, University & Country	Kabul University, Afghanistan