

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_88421
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Different Microbial Inoculum on Mung Bean (<i>Vigna radiata</i> L.) Growth, Development, and Nutrient Availability.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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

(<https://www.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The manuscript is original and very interesting in fact pulses such as Mung bean are excellent sources of proteins. In addition to being considered important sources of fiber, vitamins and minerals. However, I would like to draw attention to some information contained in the text. The manuscript notes: "Phosphorus like nitrogen is an essential nutrient. Currently, 5 % of Indian soils have appropriate available P, while 49.3% are in the low category 48.8 % are in the medium category and 1.9% are in the high category. Plants are only available with 25 % to 30 % of applied P and the remaining P is converted into insoluble P (Sharma and Khurana, 1997)". As it is relevant information, it would be advisable to put more current information, considering that 25 years have passed since 1997. The manuscript notes: "In recent year, several strains of fungi and phosphate solubilizing bacteria have been isolated. The mechanism of actions of these microorganisms involves secretion of organic acids which lower the pH and increase the availability of sparingly soluble phosphorus sources". However, it is missing to cite the reference that contains this information.	
Minor REVISION comments	On topic of conclusion, it would be advisable to remove the table 1 and add it to topic Results and Discussion.	
Optional/General comments	To complete the study, it would be advisable in the final part of the work (the topic conclusion) to pay attention to the practical meaning of the study, in addition to specific recommendations for farmers.	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Antônio Francisco de Sousa
Department, University & Country	E.E.E.P Dom Walfrido Teixeira Vieira, Brazil