

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_113940
Title of the Manuscript:	The therapy of diseases using Phylloplane bacteria
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lac k of Novel ty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/> Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	1- Write a few sentences about the importance of this manuscript to the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be necessary for this part. R/ IMPORTANT MANUSCRIPT DUE TO THE RESEARCH TOPIC; PEST CONTROL IN CROP. A) ACCORDING TO THE MANUSCRIPT, IT MUST BE A MINI-REVIEW. AUTHORS MUST PUT THIS DEFINITION IN THE TITLE. B) AUTHORS MUST REVIEW MOST OF THE SCIENTIFIC NAMES OF THE MICROORGANISMS MENTIONED IN THE TEXT, WHICH HAVE BEEN WRONGLY NAMED, ACCORDING TO THE INTERNATIONAL CODE OF NOMENCLATURE. C)- THE ABSTRACT SHOULD BE IMPROVED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE JOURNAL'S GUIDELINES, BECAUSE THE AUTHORS DO NOT DEFINE OBJECTIVES, METHODOLOGY, RESEARCH PERIOD, INSTITUTION RESPONSIBLE FOR THE RESEARCH, CITY AND COUNTRY, ETC.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	2- Is the title of the article appropriate? (If not, suggest an alternative title) R/ TITLE APPROPRIATE FOR THE TOPIC. IT SHOULD ADD THE WORD REVIEW OR MINI-REVIEW TO THE TITLE. ARE THERE ALREADY OTHER ARTICLES ON THE TOPIC?	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. -	3- Is the article abstract comprehensive? Do you suggest adding (or deleting) some points in this section? Write your suggestions here. R/ THEY SHOULD BE MODIFIED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE JOURNAL'S GUIDELINES. (OBJECTIVE, PERIOD, RESEARCH LOCATION, METHODOLOGY, RESULTS AND CONCLUSION)	

Review Form 3

Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	4- Are the subsections and the structure of the manuscript appropriate? R/ THE AUTHORS DO NOT FOLLOW THE JOURNAL'S GUIDELINES AND DO NOT SUBDIVIDE INTO SUBSECTIONS, DO NOT NUMBER THE SECTIONS. THEY DID NOT PUT AN INTRODUCTION AT THE BEGINNING OF THE MANUSCRIPT, AFTER THE ABSTRACT, AS IS TRADITIONAL. THEY DO NOT DEFINE THE JUSTIFICATION OF THE RESEARCH IN THE INTRODUCTION.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	5- Write a few sentences about the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be necessary for this part. R/ THIS MANUSCRIPT IS OF GREAT IMPORTANCE FOR FOOD PRODUCING COUNTRIES, BECAUSE IT DEALS WITH THE CONTROL OF PESTS CAUSED BY MICRO ORGANISMS, USING OTHER CONTROLLING MICRO ORGANISMS. A)- AUTHORS MUST FOLLOW THE JOURNAL'S GUIDELINES TO ACHIEVE A PUBLISHABLE MANUSCRIPT. START WITH AN INTRODUCTION AND THEN SUBDIVIDING AND NUMBERING EACH SECTION. B) UPDATE THE BIBLIOGRAPHY USED. DEFINE THE PERIOD THAT COVERS THE RESEARCH. C) CORRECT ALL SCIENTIFIC NAMES USED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE INTERNATIONAL CODES FOR EACH TYPE OF SPECIES.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	6- Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions for additional references, please mention them in the review form. R/ THERE WERE 45 REFERENCES IN THE TEXT AND ONLY 44 REFERENCES APPEAR IN THE LIST. THE REFERENCE [34] DOES NOT APPEAR IN THE TEXT, APPARENTLY BECAUSE OF A TYPING ERROR. THE REFERENCES ARE OUT OF DATE IN RELATION TO THE YEAR OF PUBLICATION. 41 OF THEM ARE FROM 2000-2019, WHICH INDICATES AN AVERAGE OF 2012, 12 YEARS LATE. THERE ARE STILL THREE REFERENCES FROM 1987-1994.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Minor comments on REVIEW 7- Is the quality of the language/English of the article adequate for academic communications? A/ THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE IS USED AND APPROPRIATE, BUT IT SHOULD BE REVIEWED FOR SOME WORDS THAT WERE TYPED WRONG OR PRESENT SOME DOUBT, (RED SIGNS)	
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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anselmo Enrique Ferrer Hernandez
Department, University & Country	Havana University, Cuba