



Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_38868
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of INM on Soil Enzymes, Microbial Biomass Carbon and Microbial Population under Okra Cultivation
Type of the 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>)

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)
--	---------------------------	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Compulsory REVISION comments	Abstract: is not structured with objectives, experimental design, place and duration of the study, methodology, results and conclusion. INM, MBC, RD- mention what it means by extension the first time you show up at work units $\text{g}^{-1} \text{hour}^{-1}$ change to $\text{g}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$; Vermicompost @ ???; Introduction: built on very old references Material and methods: inform the geographic coordinates of the experiment; Treatments not clear inform what does RDF, FYM, RD, PSB, MOP, SSP lack of information on humidity, irrigation, pest control. The methods used and described in the methodology are very old does not have recent authors who have revalidated these methods? Tabataba and Bremner (1969) is correct? Zornoja <i>et al.</i> (2009) is correct? or Zornoza statistical analysis does not mention method, program, treatment .. line 92 - unit $\text{g}^{-1} \text{hr}^{-1}$ change to $\text{g}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$ Results and discussion- to better explore the results, for all the analyzes the highest result was always cited for that variable, but I missed the merit figures of the statistical analyzes as P and standard deviation to be able to affirm the differences between the treatments. References: 85% of references are very old	Abstract: all these points has been mentioned in respective section. Objective is mentioned in introduction, experimental design, place and duration of study in material and method. Full Form of INM, MBC, RD has been given. units $\text{g}^{-1} \text{hour}^{-1}$ has been changed to $\text{g}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$; Vermicompost @ ???; means vermicompost at the rate of.....@ has been replaced with at the rate of some old references has been deleted from the introduction. Material and methods: Information about geographic coordinates of the experiment has been given. Full Forms of RDF, FYM, RD, PSB, MOP, SSP has been also given. For irrigation and pest control standard cultural practices has been followed uniformly for all the plots. In the methodology standard methods has been used because of that old references has been given. Tabataba and Bremner (1969) and Tabataba and Bremner (1970) both are included in the reference so both the references are correct. Zornoza is correct and Zornoja is replaced with Zornoza. method, program, treatment has already mentioned in material and method for statistical analysis unit $\text{g}^{-1} \text{hr}^{-1}$ changed to $\text{g}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$ Results and discussion: For all the analyzes the highest result has been cited for that variables. Author has tried to remove some of the old references but very less article are available for this topic because of that old references have been cited.
Minor REVISION comments	put the units of the variables in the international standard inform p and RSD for the data	Units of the variables has been given in the international standards.
Optional/General comments		