



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_36814
Title of the Manuscript:	Field Evaluation of Arbuscular Mycorrhizal Fungal Formulations on Production Performance of Potato (<i>Solanum tuberosum</i> L.) cv. Kufri Sindhuri
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	In the present manuscript the authors studied the field evaluation of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungal formulations on production performance of potato (<i>Solanum tuberosum</i> L.) 4cv. Kufri Sindhuri Abstract. the authors must give values to quantify the obtained results In the “introduction”, *literature of review is very limited; the authors should incorporate information to explain the proposed study topic. *the authors should design objectives clearly and should provide the background as to why the study was carried out. *line 37, add reference: This mutual combination provides the fungus 36 relatively constant and direct access to mono or dimeric carbohydrate, such as glucose and sucrose generated by the plant during photosynthesis (Reference?) Materials and methods: This section is the most important part of the manuscript. If it is not provided with complete details, the investigation will never be understood to any reader *The materials and methods section is not consistent with the results; this section needs to be rephrased. Please provide details on: ** the variety of potato used, **the origin and composition of the inoculum (spores, mycelium, mycorrhizal roots,) ** the measurement parameters Results and discussion The results are not well discussed; The authors should discuss the results according to, for example, establishment of mycorrhization and root colonization. Statistical studies do not appear in Table 1 Add conclusion References *Check references 1, 7, 16. *Reference 10, add Eckard G. Neumann E, George E. Eckard G. Does the presence of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi 140 influence growth and nutrient uptake of a wild-type tomato cultivar and a 141 mycorrhiza-defective mutant, cultivated with roots sharing the same soil volume? 142 New Phytologist. 2005;166(2):601-609; *Reference 14, replaces Boulois HD by Dupré de Boulois H; *Refernce 15, replaces Sirohi P by Sirohi S	Abstract was revised as instructed. Modifications have been executed as per the recommendations. Desired changes have been made. The required have been done. Conclusion was included. Revisions have been made. George E stands for Eckhard George. Sirohi P stands for Pradeep Sirohi.



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		