

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	Research 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The topic covered for this manuscript is important for scientific community. The use of biofertilisers for enhancement of soil fertility needs to be explored more. Hence the use of beneficial bacteria in enhancing P contribution is vital.</p> <p>2. The title is suitable for the research.</p> <p>3. The abstract is longer than 300 words. There are missing aspects that are important, ie the design is not clearly described. Data collection is also not clear. There is more contribution from the results section that can actually be minimised to include more of the materials and methods.</p> <p>4. The structure of the manuscript is fine, all subsections are included in the manuscript.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is not scientifically correct. 1. The abstract has to be improved as highlighted above. 2. The introduction requires major revision that will include the description of the cultivar and its soil demands. 3. Materials and Methods section is poorly written. Firstly there is no study site description, which would highlight the climatic conditions of the area. The bio fertilisers depend more on the climate and the soil conditions of the given area, and this does not come out clearly. I have made comments in text. The factorial design is inappropriately utilised in this study, since there is only one factor with 6 treatments that are being assessed. The data analysis method is not mentioned, together with the software used. 4. Results and discussion section is just too short, and does not really relay describe the results fully. Only two paragraphs for discussion covered Table 1 and Figure 1. Table 2 was not describe nor discussed. 5. Conclusion starts by mentioning non-existent factor, which is pea varieties. Therefore the conclusion does not correlate with the materials and methods and the results of this study.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Language usage is fair, however, there are obvious editorial mistakes such as use of spacing. The abstract size is also not correct.</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:	Pholosho M Kgopa
Department, University & Country	University of Limpopo, South Africa