

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_78481
Title of the Manuscript:	Isolation and screening of quorum quenching rhizobacterial isolates from the experimental farms of Gandhi krishi vigyana Kendra, Bengaluru, Karnataka, India
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.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	<p>Reviewer's comment From my point of view, it is an excellent research proposal for Rhizobacteria related to the Rhizosphere of the crops under study. My comments are related to the methodology, from my point of view, details were lacking to report, which will support the article technically and scientifically.</p>	<p>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></p>
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>My comments are related to the methodology, it has some details that can better technically and scientifically your article.</p> <p>2.1. Collection of soil samples and isolation of Rhizobacteria from the rhizosphere of agricultural crops.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It does not mention the sample size per crop, the phenological stage of the sampled crop, and the repeats per crop. 2. Soil moisture conditions at the time of sampling, degree of slope of the agricultural plot and ambient soil temperature. 3. Geographic coordinates and altitude. 4. Laboratory <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4.1. One gram of the collected soil was added to 100 ml of sterile water blank, mixed well, and serially diluted into water blanks to obtain a 10⁻⁶ dilution. I think it would be interesting to mention the repetitions per crop, which supports the data generated and reduce the bias of the published information. 4.2 Size of the soil particles (diameter of the particles) used in the culture media. 4.3 From the 10⁻⁶ dilution, one ml is pipetted, seeded in nutrient agar medium and incubated at 28 ± 2 ° C until the appearance of bacterial colonies. I think it would be important to mention the number of repetitions, to avoid bias in the results. <p>Results</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In table 2.% of QQ isolates obtained. Letters are reported, it remains to indicate what they refer to and indicate at the bottom of the table. 2. Table 3. Bacterial isolates positive for quorum quenching. Not mentioned in the body of the writing 3. Table 5. Biochemical characterization of the quorum quenching bacterial isolates (Table 5). It does not report any Table, but in the body of the document it says Table. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<p>These are details that the author can consider, it is up to the discretion. These are details that the author can consider, it is up to the discretion.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>It is an interesting article, it fulfills the requisite for its publication.</p>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	Ricardo González Mateos
Department, University & Country	Autonomous University of Guerrero, Mexico