



**J. K. Press**

Journal Name:

[Journal of Global Agriculture and Ecology](#)

Manuscript Number:

**Ms\_JOGAE\_11885**

Title of the Manuscript:

**Efficacy of Plant Growth Promoting Rhizobacteria to Improve the Biochemical Properties and Development of Wheat Seedlings under Drought Stress Control**

Type of the Article



## 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's feedback
<p><b><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li><b>1. Is the manuscript important for the scientific community? (Please write a few sentences on this manuscript)</b></li><li><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></li><li><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li><li><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li><li><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li><li><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions for additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></li></ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>Strengths:</p> <p>The text provides a detailed description of the methodology used in the study, including the preparation of inoculants, the detection of PEG tolerance in wheat, and the morphological and biochemical studies carried out. References to the methods used are mentioned, allowing readers to seek more details if necessary. Information is provided on the observed results, such as plant growth parameters and the results of biochemical</p> <p>Studies. Weaknesses:</p> <p>The text mentions that the pre-isolated PGPR strain KD-3B from the rhizosphere of rice plants was used, but does not provide data on this isolation. Providing this data could strengthen the validity of the study. In the "Infusion of PGPR and treatment for drought stress" section, two types of treatments are mentioned, but it is not clear whether these treatments were applied to different groups of seedlings or whether all seedlings received both treatments. The text ends abruptly after mentioning the Bradford test to determine protein content. It would be helpful to provide more details on the results of this test and how they were interpreted in the context of the study. Although the methods used for the morphological and biochemical studies are mentioned, no details are provided on the specific results of these studies. Providing these details could help readers better understand the findings of the study. No discussion or conclusion is provided that summarizes the findings of the study and its importance. This section could help readers</p>	



J. K. Press

	<p>understand the impact and implications of the study results. No limitations of the study are mentioned. Recognizing limitations can help readers evaluate the validity and applicability of the study results. No summary or introduction is provided that establishes the purpose of the study and its context. This could help readers understand why the study was conducted and what was expected to be achieved. No literature review is mentioned. A literature review can provide context for the study and demonstrate how it builds on previous research. No ethics statement is provided. In scientific studies, it is important to mention any ethical considerations, such as the treatment of animals in experiments or the informed consent of human participants. No conflict of interest statement is provided. It is important to declare any potential conflicts of interest to ensure transparency and integrity of the study. No funding statement is provided. It is important to mention any source of funding for the study to ensure transparency. No acknowledgments are provided. It is common to thank people who have contributed to the study but do not meet the criteria to be authors.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<p><b>Optional</b> comments</p>		



# J. K. Press

## **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Dustin Tahisin Gómez Rodríguez</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universitaria Agustina, Colombia</b>