SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Plant & Soil Science**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJPSS_63809**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Evaluation of Elites Isolates of Brady Rhizobia Nodulating on Groundnut Varieties (A. hyogaea L.) at Assosa District of Western Ethiopia.**
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)

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	1. **Please, remove any typo and grammar errors (e.g.** *The treatments consists* **,** of evaluated **…. etc). Many words should be removed and/or added such as "The, a, an…etc" Besides, proofreading by English expert is recommended for this article**. 2. **TITLE is too long (20 words), although it is easy and clear. Thus, it should be reduced. The title must include what is your vital finding and what you have used and accomplished.** 3. **Also, the ABSTRACT is too long. Academic abstract should include the research gap, contribution, methodology, valuable finding and conclusion. Where is the research gap at the beginning of the abstract and your contribution to the related field? Mention just the precise detailed of your Methodology. Please just address your significant finding and result.** 4. **Kindly, use the recent and up-to-date papers, such as published articles in 2020 and 2019, to clarify your literature and background in the INTRODUCTION section.** 5. **Please, create sentences including your structural work, research gap, contribution and what the authors going to investigate in this research at the last paragraph of the INTRODUCTION section.** 6. **Kindly, if applicable, afford a photograph details (for each section 2.2, 2.2 and 2.3) about your section TREATMENTS AND EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN for more research clarification.** 7. **It is recommended by the reviewer to draw a flowchart of the methodology steps in the EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN section to help the reader and to strengthen your work.** 8. **Limitation of this work should be included in the Treatments and Experimental Design section or in the beginning of the RESULT section.** 9. **Although the result is reasonable and reliable, but it needs to be evaluated with standard numbers, upper and lower limits, and figures** 10. **The reviewer believes that for publishing a particular article, it should write (Conclusion and recommendation) Instead of writing (Summary and recommendation).** 11. **The CONCLUSION is well written and understandable.** 12. **Please, let the CONCLUSION answer the aims of the study and also provide what this study add to what was already known on this topic.** 13. **Please cite the recent and latest articles that relevant to your work since the current cited articles have just up to 2016.** 14. **Please provide the DOI for your references if available.**	
Minor REVISION comments	1. **Please provide the title of x-axis in FIGURES 1 and 2.** 15. **Tables need clarification and refinement such as " ^{1})" , "0" and "D" are not with same line.. Besides, the tables cells not compatible with each other's.**	
Optional/General comments	This study is an attempt to evaluate of Elites Isolates of Brady Rhizobia Nodulating on groundnut varieties (A. hyogaea L.) at Assosa district. The paper is well written and the results are almost satisfactory. I request authors to correct the manuscript as per the mentioned comments before proceeding further as it helps to maintain the reputation of the journal. After correcting these revisions, I suggest accepting for publishing in such an excellent journal. With my best regards.	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Mahir M. Hason**
Department, University & Country	**Technology, Disaster Management Canter, Iraq**