



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_44804
Title of the Manuscript:	Symbiotic efficiency of commercial and native rhizobia of cowpea (Vigna unguiculata L.) in South Western Kenya
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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	There is lack of reproducibility of results obtained by the authors. Why in the same soil condition with the same variety of Rhizobium inoculation, the results show dramatic variation? The two bacteria isolated from the nodules, both Bacillus species were not characterized for their Plant Growth promoting activities, eg. Phosphate solubilisation, plant hormone production or siderophore production.	- Comment on reproducibility of results- It is true that Rhizobium inoculation had no consistent influence on nodule formation across all seasons and had no effects on growth or yield of cowpea. The reasons for the observations were that the strain of cowpea rhizobia used (which is the only one commercialised in Kenya) had low symbiotic efficiency- confirmed by very low amount of nitrogen fixed (Table 9). The possible reasons for low symbiotic efficiency of rhizobia in the study sites are discussed in detail (line 298-312 of manuscript). - Comment on non characterization of growth promotion of Bacillus. This study was able to characterise the phylogenetic affiliation of both species of bacteria (Fig 4) but due to funding limitation, biochemical characterisation e.g. phosphate solubilisation or siderophore production is a knowledge gap that can be addressed in future studies.
Minor REVISION comments	The number of references cited is too many. Only the relevant references should be given.	- The reason for too many literature citations is due to the references for protocols used for soil tests, rhizobial isolation and molecular studies, therefore the authors request that all the references be retained
Optional/General comments	Reduce the length of the manuscript by eliminating some repetitions.	In order to reduce manuscript length and improve on the manuscript, the following changes were made: - The subtitles in abstract were removed - Section 3.3 in the original manuscript, including Fig. 1-3, were omitted in the revised manuscript. Consequently, lines 313-318 in the discussion part of the original manuscript were deleted.

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link: <http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>