SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Experimental Agriculture International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JEAI_37487**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Nutrient concentration of growth media affect relationship between root endophytic fungi and host plant**
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 submitted manuscript the authors studied the effect of "nutrient concentration of growth media affect relationship between root endophytic fungi and host plant". The study concludes that nutrient concentration of growth media affected the plant responsiveness to inoculation with EPF. Positive response in terms of plant growth was observed in lower nutrient concentration of MS media. Although the manuscript provides some new information but the way it was presented and the language of the manuscript which is poor makes it unacceptable in its current form. However, it is recommended that the manuscript after thorough revision may be considered for publication. The abstract is good and represents the contents of the manuscript. Introduction is good and provides background for the conducted studies but requires language editing. Some of the sentences have not been properly structured and do not make sense. The methodologies and protocols used are adequate but lack consistency. Good statistical analysis. Results have been presented properly and discussed cogently supported with suitable references. References conform to the style of the journal except few. In the reference 7, full journal name has been given while in all the other references, journal abbreviations have been used. The authors are advised to consult "Author Guidelines" and the latest issue of the journal for guidance and for writing proper references. All the citations in the text should be double-checked to ensure that these are listed in the references list. The standard of English is poor. The manuscript is full of syntactical errors. There is no proper use of verbs, words, articles on numerous occasions. There were many cases in the manuscript where the sentences were not properly structured, suggesting that the paper would improve if it could be edited for language and technical correctness.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Tariq Mukhtar***
Department, University & Country	***Department of Plant Pathology, Pir Mehr Ali Shah Arid Agriculture University, Pakistan***