

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_126297
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF INOCULATING SYMBIOTIC MICROORGANISMS ON ACACIA MANGIUM GROWN ON COCONUT FIBER.
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 ‘**lack of Novelty**’, 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>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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. It help in planting decision to farmer 2. Helps in seeing the effects of inoculants in agricultural improvement 3. Help in knowing whether yield will improve or not when using microbial inoculants	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	EFFECT OF INOCULATING SYMBIOTIC MICROORGANISMS ON ACACIA MANGIUM GROWN ON COCONUT FIBER. SHOULD BE EFFECTS	EFFECTS OF INOCULATING SYMBIOTIC MICROORGANISMS ON ACACIA MANGIUM GROWN ON COCONUT FIBER.
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.	The abstract is not comprehensive enough; evaluable data need to be included for with or without treatments.	The summary has been revised to take account of the comments made
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	yes	
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.	The manuscript is not scientifically robust enough, abstract need to be reworked	The summary has been revised to take account of the comments made
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	They are not sufficient and recent, writer should look up more recent works from 2014 upward	The references have been updated in the new version
Minor REVISION comments		This has been taken into account
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No, plurals and singulars are not properly used	
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)	