

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Advances in Research |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AIR_127448 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Dual Inoculation with Bradyrhizobium japonicum and Phosphate Solubilizing Fungus Improves Plant Growth and Root Nodulation in Soybean (Glycine max (L.) Merr.) |
| Type of the Article | |

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

| Compulsory REVISION comments | Reviewer's comment | Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i> |
|---|--|---|
| Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | Overall, the manuscript holds significant importance for the scientific community, particularly in enhancing crop productivity. The combination of biological fertilizers with organic fertilizers plays a crucial role in mitigating climate change. | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | It needs minor rearrangement "Dual Inoculation with <i>Bradyrhizobium japonicum</i> and Phosphate-Solubilizing Fungus Enhances Plant Growth and Root Nodulation in Soybean (<i>Glycine max (L.) Merr.</i>) | |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | The abstract lacks clarity regarding its objectives and methodology (treatments). Additionally, the conclusions are not clearly articulated or mentioned in the abstract. | |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? | It needs rearrangement | |
| Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | Scientifically, the title of the manuscript and its results play a significant role in the scientific community and must be technically robust. However, this manuscript requires thorough proofreading and restructuring to adhere to the standards of scientific research writing. | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | yes | |
| Minor REVISION comments | It must be needing intensive proofreading | |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | | |
| Optional/General comments | | |

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: | Gidey Tareke Gebremedhin |
| Department, University & Country | Axum University, Ethiopia |