



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_47842
Title of the Manuscript:	Isolation and Characterization of Phosphate Solubilising Rhizobia Nodulating Wild Field pea (<i>Pisum sativum</i> var. <i>abyssinicum</i>) from Southern Tigray, Ethiopia
Type of the Article	<u>Original Research Article</u>

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The manuscript entitled: Isolation and Characterization of Phosphate Solubilising Rhizobia Nodulating Wild Field pea (<i>Pisum sativum</i> var. <i>abyssinicum</i>) from Southern Tigray, Ethiopia is good in the field study research. It can concluded that the phosphate solubilizing rhizobia exhibited a broad range of ability of solubilizing TCP in vitro. Most of the isolates originated from Emba-alaje are generally able to solubilise inorganic TCP. Among all the isolates, maximum potential to solubilize tri-calcium phosphates are HUDRI-8 and HUDRI-25. Results found an inverse correlation between amount of solubilized phosphate and pH of the culture medium. Isolate that are effective in N ₂ fixation and able to solubilise TCP are found to be effective in improving nodulation and plant growth under greenhouse condition. Further research is recommended to investigate its efficacy under field trials in diverse soil types having different amount of soil P.	Thank you for your constructive and impressive ideas to edit my manuscript and I have tried to correct accordingly. NB. But I am not clear with the numbers you put it in front of each line (1-465) not only in yours while in most of the editors
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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)	