

ReviewForm1.7

JournalName:	JournalofExperimental AgricultureInternational
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_JEAI_115034
Titleof the Manuscript:	CharacterizationandEvaluationofNativeRhizobiumofGroundnut(ArachishypogaeaL.)andSoybean(GlycinemaxL.)
TypeoftheArticle	OriginalResearchArticle

ReviewForm1.7

PART1:ReviewComments

	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 a 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. In the current conditions, finding biological solutions for problems related to the environment and especially the edaphic ecosystem, represents a target for the international scientific community. In this context, finding effective microbial strains that contribute to the sustainability of agriculture is an agricultural requirement. The plants studied are of national and global interest, taking into account the position of the native country in world production, but also the range of compounds contained, beneficial for human nutrition and industry, as well as the positive impact on the soil.</p> <p>The materials are described and the tests for the characterization of the isolated bacterial strains and the method for nitrogen determination are listed. Pay attention to the paragraph that is repeated and that should be deleted.</p> <p>2. The title of the work is simple, concrete and reflects the content of the work very well.</p> <p>3. The summary is as succinct as possible and defines very well the purpose, the results and the methods used.</p> <p>4. The work is divided into sections, but for a better highlighting of the methods and the results obtained after each test, I recommend dividing the Materials and Results sections into sub-sections.</p> <p>5. In the current context, the data obtained meet the requirements of the scientific community</p> <p>6. The bibliographic references are sufficient, the new references are supplemented with some older references</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART2:

	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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>no</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Borozan Aurica
Department, University & Country	University of Life Sciences "King Mihai I" from Timisoara, Romania