



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_27689
Title of the Manuscript:	Productivity of Lentil (<i>Lens culinaris</i> L.) as influenced by different biofertilizers and phosphorus regimes.
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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	I suggest retitle the paper, because the author makes mention of various biofertilizers when only work with a single microorganism. The title is not appropriate to the work presented. Enrich the abstract with further information of the results. The materials and methods section lacks sufficient information. Should explain treatments and phosphorus levels in this section, exactly as explained in the abstract section. It does not mention how many bacteria/g of inoculant use. Include origin of the strain of rhizobium which makes mention. Specify this (UI, InRh, InPSB & InRh +PSB) in the section material and methods. What is it? The document doesn't show statistical analysis. The results do not show adequate discussion. Pag 1 Line 28 The reference ANONYMOUS, 2007 -08 doesn't match the reference date mentioned in the literature cited section ANONYMOUS, 2008 -09	Title of the paper has been changed Added as desired Done as desired Done as desired Done as desired Done as desired Done as desired Done Done Done



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Pag 1 Line 32 The reference Chaubey, 1999 doesn't match the reference date mentioned in the literature cited section Chaubey, 1990 Pag 3 Line 84 The reference Khare, 1988 doesn't match the reference date mentioned in the literature cited section Khare, 1998 Check the correct way to insert references in the document again. We recommend using at least 15-20 references in order to improve this paper. It is recommended to extend the discussion section with more current references. It suggests updating references. The author uses old references, suggested upgrade of at least 70% of references. Review the rules of General Guideline for Authors of this journal again.	Done Done Discussion has been extended as desired and 13 latest references have been . Added 16 latest references The general guidelines have been used in the revised manuscript
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		