



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_42145
Title of the Manuscript:	NUTRITIONAL STATUS OF COWPEA PLANTS INOCULATED AND COINOCULATED WITH RIZOBACTERIAS IN ASSOCIATED WITH PHOSPHATE FERTILIZATION
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	Title needs changed. There are a number of "English use" cases that need to be addressed. The basis for 'negative interactions when both bacteria are inoculated should be addressed earlier when they are mentioned, rather than at the very end of the ms. A basis for not also including treatments with Azospirillum alone should be mentioned, or at least tell why it was used I co-inoculations in the first place.	- The title of the manuscript was changed to " NUTRITIONAL STATUS OF COWPEA PLANTS INOCULATED WITH <i>Bradyrhizobium</i> AND <i>Azospirillum brasilense</i> IN ASSOCIATED WITH PHOSPHATE FERTILIZATION IN SOIL AMAZONIAN" -The bacteria <i>Azospirillum brasilense</i> does not promote the biological nitrogen fixation when associated with leguminous plants, but only to promote the growth of plants. For this reason it was not included as a single treatment. The goal was to join the joint so that the <i>Azospirillum</i> inoculation act in higher growth of roots, by radicles and consequently greater absorption and utilization of nutrients by plants of Cowpea.
Minor REVISION comments	In my opinion, Tables 1 and 2 would make more sense if they followed the other tables, in which case they may not even be necessary. Other tables would benefit from editing to put a line or two between the upper and lower sections Some cases of 'proofs' seem overstated.	-The table 1 and 2 presents a summary of the analysis of variance, as the values P. So, what is less than $P < 0.05$ significant and for $P > 0.05$, not significant. The authors prefer to put that kind of table so that the reader has total understanding of all variables analyzed, and which were significant or not, with the different treatments. From this information the authors discuss only significant data for the different factors, making an interactive and independent approach. For this, the tables are inserted at the beginning of the presentation of results and discussion. However, the removal of these tables in text, not in any article.
Optional/General comments	Lots of good observations	-All submissions and corrections suggested writing in the text have been changed and are highlighted in yellow. Thanks to the reviewer for valuable contributions.