



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_26467
Title of the Manuscript:	Arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi improve root ramification and vegetative growth of young plum tree under continuous deficit irrigation
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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	MS describe the role of AM fungi in alleviating the water stress Plum tree. Major revision required here... 1. Objectives are not well defined 2. No clarity in method section 3. Application of inoculums per pot was not done properly 4. How mixed inoculums of two AM species can be applied together? And when checking AM colonization how it is possible to know authors which AM species was functional... 5. What was criteria checked for AM colonization? arbuscules? Vesicles? Or hyphal? And how from two selected AM species how authors are convinced that which AM species was functional? 6. Experimental design was not proper. There is need to reset the experiment. There should be three treatments i.e. R. intraradices, F. Mossea and one control with minimum three replicates of each. Along with different water levels. 7. What was the frequency of checking AM colonization? 30 days? 60 days? 8. Although it is well known that AM species helps in water uptake during stressful conditions so there is need to check efficiency of each AM species separately along with	Thank you for reviewing the MS 1. The MS was improved taking into account the reviewer's comments with clarification of some aspects. 2. The experimental design was more detailed. 3. Our objective was to know if AMF improve considerably the efficiency of deficit irrigation on young plum trees under Moroccan conditions, regardless of specific species of AMF used. In fact, according to previous work, several AMF species were isolated specific to prunus and we choose among them the most colonizers. In addition, we opted for a mixture of two AMF species because it is concluded in several studies that the mixtures of AMF are more effective than the use of a single species of AMF. The results of this work are related to the used mixture of AMF. The comments that you have raised are very important for the continuation of our work that we expect to achieve with the support of a microbiologist.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	separate control and various water levels. Which will of more impact to scientific community. 9. Besides how vialiblity of purchase inoculums was checked..Just mixing the inoculums and presenting crude result can't be accepted. There is need to rest the experiment with suggestion to considered this manuscript for the publication.	4. The criteria checked for AM colonization were arbuscules and Vesicles. It was highlighted in the text. 5. Experimental design was more detailed. 6. Checking of AM colonization was done nine month after inoculation (highlighted in the text) 7. The viability of purchased inoculum was checked before the implementation of the trial
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Very poor..need to repeat the experiment	The MS was improved taking into account the reviewer's comments with clarification of some aspects. This work is in continuation taking into account your suggestions and the results will be published in future manuscripts.