

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	Research

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.	The manuscript entitled “Effect of nitrogen and phosphorus on nutrient use efficiency of irrigated chickpea (<i>Cicer arietinum</i> L.) under Scarce Rainfall Zone of Andhra Pradesh” is a good piece of works as it reflects the importance of pulse crop in agriculture and how to improve its productivity with the help of fertilizers.	This work is not mine, probably misjudged.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Abstract is ok but it can be more detail oriented. Methodolgy in the abstract section is lacking. Kindly provide more detail of how the experiment is conducted. Give a one line concluding statement to the abstract as well. Also, provide few keywords after the abstract.	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.	Overall the manuscript is a good work of the authors. It shows the importance of mycorrhizae and Rhizobium in the plant growth and its applications in soil. However a few corrections are there which can be corrected in order to make the manuscript suitable for publication.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	More recent references can be added. Some references are very old (more than 10 years old), change them with the recent ones. Moreover, some more references can be added in the Introduction as well as discussion section as there are very few.	The references have been updated in the new version
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	Graphs are a little blur in the result section. It can be made more clear. Also, in the tables there should be a decimal between the digits instead of a comma.	This has been taken into account

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)	