

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_102982
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF AGRICULTURAL PRACTICES IMPACT ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF ARBUSCULAR MYCORRHIZAL FUNGI
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:

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

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>This manuscript is very important for the scientific community. The reason, this information is the initial clue to identify the role of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi in various land types</p> <p>The title of the article is appropriate</p> <p>Needs a little improvement: the abstract does not show the problem under study; it is necessary to state the depth of the soil taken as the research sample; it is necessary to explain the number of spores in each type of agrosystem, and the difference in quality</p> <p>The structure of the manuscript is appropriate, but it needs a little improvement in the introduction: The background does not explain whether the community's agricultural practices choose to use natural systems using mycorrhizal fungi or mixed; it is not yet clear whether the farmers deliberately let the fungus grow in their respective fields?</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>The manuscript contains 53.3% of Scientific Journals. However, most of the references to journals and books are not up to date. Suggestion: Need additional appropriate references at least in 2014.</p> <p>1. The introduction needs to be improved, especially to include a comparison of soil containing arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi and not containing this element. 2. Use the latest references at least above 2014 so that land development that contains arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi can be traced to restore soil fertility</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, it is good for scientific communication</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>No Comment</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Heru Joko Budirianto
Department, University & Country	University of Papua, Indonesia