

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_111684
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Bionoculants on Total Chlorophyll Content, Yield of Soybean and Fertility Status of a Vertisols
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

Comments to the Authors	Reviewer comments	Author's comment:
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes 2. Yes 3. Yes 4. Yes 5. Partially 6. Yes 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript reports on a field experiment conducted at the Research Farm, Department of Soil Science & Agricultural Chemistry, Jawaharlal Nehru Krishi Vishwa Vidyalaya, Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh, India, during the kharif season of 2019-20. The primary aim was to investigate the influence of bioinoculants on total chlorophyll content, soybean yield, and fertility status in Vertisols.</p> <p>Introduction: The introduction lacks a comprehensive background, including the significance of bioinoculants in sustainable agriculture and the specific challenges faced in Vertisols. A more detailed review of literature on the impact of microbial consortia on crop yield and soil fertility could provide a clearer context for the study.</p> <p>Objectives: Additionally, the objectives should be more explicitly outlined to guide readers through the research focus.</p> <p>Methods: The experimental design and methodology are adequately described. However, specifying the microbial consortia used and their respective concentrations would enhance the replicability of the study.</p> <p>Results: Quantitative data on total chlorophyll content, soybean yield, and soil fertility parameters are present but lack statistical analyses. Incorporating statistical significance and variability measures would strengthen the robustness of the results.</p> <p>Discussion: The discussion is concise but could delve deeper into interpreting the findings in comparison to existing literature. Discussing the mechanisms through which the NPK+EM+PGPR consortia influenced chlorophyll content and soil fertility would add depth.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>Conclusion: The conclusion appropriately summarizes the key findings. However, reiterating the practical implications for farmers and the broader agricultural community would enhance the conclusion's impact.</p> <p>Overall Recommendations:</p> <p>Strengthen the introduction with a more extensive literature review. Clearly state the novelty and objectives of the study. Provide more detailed information on the microbial consortia used. Include statistical analyses in the results section. Elaborate on the discussion to connect findings with existing literature. Emphasize practical implications in the conclusion for broader applicability.</p> <p>Addressing these points will enhance the manuscript's clarity, scientific rigor, and contribution to the field.</p>	
--	--	--

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:	Robert Matos
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Amapá, Brazil