



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2015_AJEA_18088
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of nitrogen levels and Arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi on biomass production, mineral nutrition, sugar and total phenolic content of two zea mays cultivars.
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/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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Title is clear Abstract is not representative Key words : Add Chlorophyll ,Phosphorus ; Introduction is comprehensible, organized, and supported by appropriate references. Materials and Methods is clearly established Results and Discussion Results are consistent with the proposed objective and methods. The Discussion include the interpretation of the results and compare the most relevant results . Conclusion is not representative of this study	Ok, the necessary has been done in the manuscript namely: the rewrite of the abstract and conclusion so as to be representative as you asked. Thank you very much
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		Abstract and conclusion have received some modifications