

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_111913
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of different vesicular - arbuscular mycorrhizal (VAM) fungi on the seedling growth of Tecomella undulata
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
--	---------------------------	---

Review Form 1.7

<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? It will be good when authors work on the paper Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? When authors work better on the paper Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Yes when authors work on the points I made Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. Authors need to include new or modern papers related to the topic to enhance the paper. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, but authors need to work</p> <p>yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>It will be good enough when authors make main changes on the papers</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>It should be accepted when main changes are done. This research is worth it but: 1 the current taxonomy changed Rhizophagus to Glomus, the authors need to update to be in line with the progress on this genus. 2. The work is interesting but it does not take advantage of the innovation in the way of inoculating trees like the one they used, it must be reconsidered to make it attractive 3 . It is necessary to explain the statistical analysis they used because, as shown, they do not give strength and value to the experimental results. 4. The discussion lacks sufficient arguments to explain the positive effects of the Rhizophagus strains used on the plant. 5 the conclusion is a summary, not a conclusion that explains why one strain of Rhizophagus was better than others Ultimately they need to address these points for the article to be accepted.</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<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>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Juan Manuel Sánchez-Yáñez</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Universidad Michoacana de San Nicolas de Hidalgo, Mexico</p>