

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_108486
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Phosphorus Solubilizing Bacteria with different levels of phosphorus in field pea (<i>Pisum sativum</i>)
Type of the Article	

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, it is.</p> <p>No. because of the experimental design is not sufficient to test the effect of phosphate solubilizing bacteria.</p> <p>No, the abstract is not comprehensive. There is a lack of fundamental information to understand the work. For example: the authors talk about a factorial experiment with 7 treatments, but in the end they demonstrate only 6 treatments. Furthermore, the authors mention a combination of 30:60:30 that it is not possible to know what it means. Furthermore, the abstract is very vague and there is no introduction supporting the work carried out.</p> <p>No, there is so much subsection. Mainly in materials and methods.</p> <p>There are a reasonable number of references, but they are not cited in the text.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No. The language is terrible. There is a lot of sensationalism in the text and little scientific basis for the statements. The variables are discussed in unknown and unofficial units of measurement of the international system. In addition to not all proposed variables being presented and discussed, statistical methods are not used to compare results.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	André Somavilla
Department, University & Country	Instituto Mato-Grossense do Agronegócio, Brazil