



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BMRJ_30828
Title of the Manuscript:	Potential for Biochar as an Alternate Carrier to Peat moss for the Preparation of Rhizobia bio inoculum
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Paper has more than 32% plagiarism, very serious issue Submitted to "Higher Education Commission, Pakistan", "psrcentre.org", "Hale, Lauren, Madeline Luth, and David Crowley. "Biochar characteristics relate to its utility as an alternative soil inoculum carrier to peat and vermiculite", Soil Biology and Biochemistry, 2015." as shown in plagiarism report (plagiarism check.pdf) at page 12, only data is modified. So in present state paper is not acceptable.	Dear Editor: I agreed with reviewer and the manuscript has been reconstructed to lower the similarity index to the acceptable levels. Reconstructed phrases have been lighted with yellow beside the original phrases. The modified manuscript is attached with this message. thanks
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	-NA-	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	-NA-	