

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_85969
Title of the Manuscript:	Mycorrhizal fungi and their importance in the conservation of the Caatinga
Type of the Article	Review 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:

(<https://www.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/editorial-policy>)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- The manuscript is well structured- However, It needs many improvements:- The abbreviation Arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMFs) is cited in the introduction part (it is unnecessary to use another abbreviation AM in the part 3.2)- There are many sentences in th nanuscript very long → to simplify- I highlighted in the manuscript “according to” four times, it is better to write according to “the author et al.,”and to cite the reference in the end of the sentence- I think it is necessary to include photos of these plants Caatinga and these Arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi to better illustrate what is written- And why not if possible a table summarizing the studies used as references according to the species of AMF described, to the country, year...- The aim of your work is to discuss the importance of AMF in development and conservation of Caatinga Plant However in the part 3.2 there is no argument of that ; you describe the implication and the benefits of AMF in general without liaison with Caatinga Plant- And you have concluded without a good argumentation in discussion- References should be checked according to the style recommended by the journal	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> 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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mtibaa Latifa
Department, University & Country	Military Hospital of Tunis, Tunisia