



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_59409
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF 2, 4-DICHLOROPHOXYACETIC ACID (2,4-D) AND DICHLORVOS (2,2-DICHLOROVINYL DIMETHYL PHOSPHATE DDVP) PESTICIDES ON SOIL MICROORGANISMS.
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/journal/10/editorial-policy>)

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	<p>The manuscript entitled "Effect of 2, 4-dichlorophenoxyacetic acid (2,4-d) and dichlorvos (2,2-dichlorovinyl dimethyl phosphate ddvp) pesticides on soil microorganisms" describes the toxic impact of two pesticides i.e. 2, 4-D (herbicide) and dichlorvos (insecticide) on soil microorganisms that include bacteria, fungi, actinomycetes and protozoa. The manuscript seems very short that means it is a short communication. The authors are try do their best. But there is only one experiment has been performed. I have some minor suggestion which may be helpful to improve and ship-shaping the manuscript. The suggestions are as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abstract is very length. It should only contain the key findings and not the introductory materials. The authors are advised to concise the abstract section. 2. Introduction section is also very length. Focus only on the literature available on the effect of agricultural chemicals or pesticides on soil microorganisms. Also, very old literature has been cited like 1979, 1990, 1998 etc. In the present time, there are a full of plenty literature are available on this aspect. 3. Material and methods are very short. M & M should be in detail. 4. Results are good. 5. Improve the English language throughout the manuscript 	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The language is very poor. Improve the English language throughout the manuscript</p>	
Optional/General comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohammad Shahid
Department, University & Country	Aligarh Muslim University, India