



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_39729
Title of the Manuscript:	Growth Promotion by Azospirillum brasilense in the Germination of Rice, Oat, Brachiaria and Quinoa
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:

(<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	In the submitted manuscript the authors have tried to assess the effects of <i>Azospirillum brasilense</i> on growth promotion of Rice, Oat, Brachiaria and Quinoa. The effectiveness of PGPR is well documented. The manuscript contains some useful information about the effectiveness of this bacterium; however, there are some weaknesses in the manuscript which should be addressed before its acceptance. The abstract is good; however, some of the sentences of the abstract are not grammatically correct. In the “introduction” the authors have provided background of the study. The objectives have been described clearly. The materials and methods section is consistent with the results. However, following points need to be addressed in the Materials and Methods section. The analysis of the soil used for the experiment should be provided. Please provide the average temperature of the location/greenhouse and other environmental parameters of the experiment. The treatments are not clear. How many treatments were there? Elaborate all the treatments. As the experiment was conducted in greenhouse, was it performed in pots or microplots? The results have been presented scientifically but not discussed properly. The authors in most of the cases have just said that their results are in line with those of others’. Please revise the conclusion and make some recommendation at the end. As far language of the manuscript is concerned, it is full of syntactical errors. There is no proper use of verbs, words, articles on numerous occasions. There were many cases in the manuscript where the sentences were not properly structured, suggesting that the paper would improve if it could be edited for language and technical correctness. The references on the whole are correct. Double-check all the citations in the text to ensure that they are listed in the references list and vice versa, and for accuracy (correct author names, alphabetical order of references (see the instructions in the Author Information Pack on the journal's website), title of paper, year of publication, and journal volume and page numbers).	All the corrections were accepted; The treatments were described; English has been revised.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>