

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_AJSSPN_117626
Title of the Manuscript:	Bioinoculation effect of Frankia sp. and microbial bioagents on growth and development of Elaeagnus latifolia L. seedlings: An endangered plant species of North East India
Type of the Article	Original research article

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<p>Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community because manuscript explain the symbiotic relationship between fungus and bacteria for the development of plant growth. Yes, the title is self-explanatory and it has all information which authors explain in the manuscript. But An endangered plant species of North East India has less information in the manuscript which they mention in title.</p> <p>In abstract, all the points cover and well explanatory.</p> <p>Yes, all the subsections and structure are well organized but the pictures are not organized and not well positioning.</p> <p>I think, the manuscript is scientifically correct because authors explain the biological aspect to manage the plant health, they did not use any hazardous material in the methodology which cause significant damage in the environment.</p> <p>In the aspects of references, mostly are not recent. Although, it contains sufficient references.</p>	The necessary corrections have been made.
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language is understandable, and appropriate for the readers.	
Optional/General comments	Overall, author explains their ideas and experimentation work is good. But add new references in the reference section.	

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)	None