

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_113506
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of staggered planting and application of bioinoculants on the phosphatase enzyme activity in the rhizospheric soil of Gladiolus cv. White prosperity
Type of the Article	

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> 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. The research topic is of great importance. Studying the beneficial microbial interactions that are established with some plants and especially the effect of the application of microbial consortia generates great interest due to the potential, because these interactions have a beneficial effect on the soil and are considered a fundamental tool in the sustainable and agroecological agriculture, as well as an important strategy to control phytopathogens and improve the agronomic performance of crops. 2. It is appropriate. 3. The summary is understandable. 4. The structure of the work is correct. 5. The manuscript is scientifically correct. 6. Bibliographic references are adequate. It would be interesting to expand the discussion, for which more bibliography should be reviewed. It is advisable to use more up-to-date bibliographic references; at least 30% should be from the last 5 years.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language used is appropriate and technically correct.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	- Do not use as keywords those that are already present in the title. - Some suggestions were made in the manuscript, which were incorporated as "Comments." - The scientific names of the species are written in italics.	

### 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:	<b>María Gabriela Di Barbaro</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>National University of Catamarca, Argentina</b>