



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_10400
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF DIFFERENT RATES OF PHOSPHORUS FERTILIZER ON SOYBEAN {GLYCINE MAX (L.) MERRIL} INOCULATED WITH RHIZOBIUM
Type of the Article	Original paper

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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



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	The present manuscript describes the usefulness of biological inoculants, i.e. <i>Rhizobium</i> inoculants. Yet, the scientific writing has not yet matured (See proposed corrections on the hard copy). 1. The introduction is not informative and complete. In particular, previous work on soybean inoculation with bacteria-fixing N is strikingly lacking. Biological mechanisms modulating P x bacterial activities are not mentioned as well other environmental factors such as soil humidity and acidity. Moreover, citations are poorly used. 2. Materials & methods All technical specifications are not exactly mentioned (Rhizobial inoculants and P fertilizer brand). The experimental set up is not precise. For e.g. the harvesting area is confusing... Statistics are poorly presented and may be presents a major setback. If data were not checked for the homogeneity of variances, then, the entire analyses should start all over. Therefore, the results and conclusions presented in this manuscript are wrong...See comments in the text... 3. Résultats This is the heart of the article. If my previous comment holds...Nevertheless, the overall data	Introduction: The introduction has been updated with new literature addressing the comments in the text. Materials and methods Site fully described with location, temperature, rainfall and soil type Geographic coordinates provided as latitude N 09° 24' 15.9" and longitude <i>Rhizobium</i> Italics throughout the paper • Yaralegume is the brandname • Characteristics of Soybean Cultivar (<i>Jenguma</i>) provided in the text • Inoculation: The methodology for inoculation is stated in the text • Parameters: Different parameters



SDI Review Form 1.6

	presentation is not followed by the presentation of data, for e.g. the ANOVA table is lacking as well as data related to the experimental site (soil physic-chemical data, rainfall, altitude, geographical coordinates...). Data presented are not clearly and simply depicted. Graphs are confused (Bar vs XY figures). I did recommend tables in some cases instead. 4. Discussion This section is poorest. It shows very low mature scientists. They failed to notice that indigenous strains of <i>Bradyrhizobium</i> were somewhat effective. Also, they did not check for the presence and effectivity of other soil mycobionts, arbuscular mycorrhizas which greatly impact on both the bacterial component as the efficiency of Phosphate availability in soil. Hence, there could a lot of factors interfering. To try to sort such effects out, it is recommended simply statistics in the form of correlation between dependent variables. One could ask how much shoot biomass is related to nodule number and biomass... 5. Acknowledgments. This section is missing! 6. Literature cited Research work and scientific writing are meant a deep information search. This research, included in scientific approach, stems from earlier works. This selected and harnessed information allows developing a personal thinking. Henceforth, each of the documents, chosen and analysed, contributes to scientific credibility of the research work. In this case, I did not observed upon	measured are precisely described in detail and leaf area removed from the text as suggested by the reviewers. Experimental design corrected in the text as 2 x 4 factorial arranged in Randomized Complete Block design. Rhizobial and fertilizer are mentioned in the text. Data reanalyzed and presented both in tables and graphs in the text with Anova and LSD The comments by reviewers has been incorporated and highlighted Anova and LSD presented in the tables and graphs presented clearly in the text
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	reading this manuscript.	Discussion; The data discussion section has been improved with suggestion by reviewers incorporated in the text and highlighted. Acknowledgement is not compulsory Literarture: Since the Introduction has been updated with suggestions from reviewer, the literature section has been improved and used properly. Citation have been properly used
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	A scientific article exactly requires the same qualities of thoughts like all sciences: logical, clarity and precision. This manuscript is short in these three requirements.	Clarity has been brought to the manuscript with all the corrections effected as per the recommendation by the reviewers