SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJSSPN_44901**
Title of the Manuscript:	**MICROBIAL ISOLATES FOR ENHANCEMENT OF SEED GERMINATION**
Type of the Article	**Short 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:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

SDI 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	Correct the approach given in the Introduction section since the argument revolves around biofertilizer microorganisms, but this is not consistent with the objective of this scientific paper that focus solely and exclusively on the evaluation of the promoting growth plant effect of the isolated microorganisms. It is important to present a Table with the results of the biochemical tests and fermentation of sugars applied, which served to identify the genus of microorganisms. In the Material and Methods section clarify the sentence: "The 25 seeds treated with PGPR inoculums and 25 control seeds were again sterilized and placed in petridishes", because the seeds are not sterilized but chemically sanitized and after the application of the microorganisms it does not make sense to carry out this process again, since it inactivates most of the population of PGPRs. In the Material and Methods section clarify the sentence: "The coefficient of germination was estimated by counting the emergence of germination in each seed at an interval of 24 hrs vigor index was calculated as per Copeland formula [9]", since it is not clear. Additionally, the formula for vigour index must be presented explicitly. It is essential to apply a statistical analysis to the experimental results obtained to elucidate statistical differences between treatments, it is suggested to use an analysis of variance with a means comparison test of Tukey (α=0.95) for response variables germination, coefficient of emergence and vigour index. The practical utility of the application of "coefficient of emergence" is not appreciated and nothing is discussed about the results obtained with this response variable. In general terms, the discussion is very poor, does not take into account all the results obtained and is lack of depth and bibliographic support.	
Minor REVISION comments	In the Abstract section many methodological details are given and some ideas are repeated, please synthesize and focus on the most relevant results. In the Abstract section the terms "germination efficiency" and "germination co efficiency" are used, but never are explained in the text. The terms "vigor index" and "vital index" are used interchangeably, unify to avoid confusion. Correct along the text the term "rhizhobacteria" for "rhizobacteria". In the Material and Methods section, clarify the sentence: "The moisture content in the sample was estimated after the removal of the root material or other plants remain", since it is not clear. It is suggested to unify the "Results" and "Discussion" sections to facilitate the analysis of the results and to give more coherence to the scientific paper.	
Optional/General comments	In general, review and correct the technical English used throughout the scientific article. In the Introduction section: "The chief objective of this study is to trace plant growth promoting action in Rhizobacteria isolated from local soil". Correct the verb used given that no action was taken towards the tracking or tracing of rhizobacteria in the vegetal material used.	

SDI Review Form 1.6

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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Andrés Díaz García***
Department, University & Country	***Colombia***