Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJPSS_66218**
Title of the Manuscript:	**SOIL MICROBES ARE SHAPED BY SOIL PHYSICO-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES: A BRIEF REVIEW OF EXISTING LITERATURE**
Type of the Article	**Review 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/journal/10/editorial-policy)

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	The evaluated review portrays a very important issue for the area of soil science, in which the population of microorganisms is essential for soil conservation, in addition to favoring greater plant productivity. However, such a review needs to be improved in several aspects such as: 1) Formatting: the text is outside the formatting rules. 2) The abstract needs to be improved and standardized according to the magazine's rules, in addition to the absence of keywords right after the abstract. 3) Insert the objectives of the review at the end of the introduction. 4) The review is very general, indicating only the factors that influence negatively or positively, the factors that correlate, that is, the information contained is very superficial. Therefore, I suggest that the authors go a little deeper by presenting quantitative data, whether in the body of the text and / or in figures, tables, etc. 5) The conclusions also need to be improved by relating them to the objectives. 6) Bibliographic references need to be checked and standardized. obs: I made such suggestions in comments in the text itself.	I have gone through all the useful suggestions and included the recommendations in the edited version of the text. Please refer. I do agree that the review is general. That is one issue with studies like these which are mostly field studies, since these lack generality and are context-dependent and spatiotemporally vary. I have modified the conclusions to bring forward this issue.
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)*	