

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_94330
Title of the Manuscript:	Identification and characterization of arbuscular mycorrhizal strains from the roots and rhizospheres of tomato, brinjal, chilli and onion
Type of the 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.journalajaar.com/index.php/AJAAR/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Regarding the summary. It is suggested to the authors, write the objective of the investigation (clearly) and place the most outstanding conclusion or conclusions, with respect to the objective. Authors are suggested to use keywords other than those in the title.</p> <p>In the introduction, there is information that is repetitive in the same paragraph, as well as in other paragraphs.</p> <p>In materials and methods, it is mentioned that a modification was made in a technique, however, said modifications are not described.</p> <p>It is suggested to the authors to place a section of analysis of results or statistical analysis.</p> <p>In results and discussion, in the tables, place the meaning of the abbreviations, no matter how repetitive.</p> <p>It is suggested to the authors, in the results and discussion section, to present the results and discuss them. Because the discussion section is presented later. Or separate the sections, in results and later make the discussion.</p> <p>It's conclusions</p> <p>The conclusions should be written based on the most outstanding results regarding the objective of the investigation. Authors are suggested to restructure this section.</p> <p>Regarding the references section, of the 50 references, 37 of them are from less than 2000 and the rest from 2001 to 2014. It is very important to update the information.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	Are found in the document in full	
Optional/General 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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Lucio González Montiel
Department, University & Country	Institute of Food Technology, Universidad de la Cañada, México