



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_44675
Title of the Manuscript:	Arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi and phosphorus doses in the production of Parkia nitida (Miquel) in nursery seedlings in the south of Amazonas
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	Lines 9-10. - Use different sub-section names (Aims, Study design, Place and Duration of the Study, Methodology, Results and Conclusion), as given in the MS word SDI paper template. - dry mass of the aerial part: it is better to say shoot dry mass or shoot dry weight Line 11. - It's better to separate keywords with commas (,) or semicolons (;). - Put keywords alphabetically! Line 17. A species (remove 's') Line 21, 72. 40m, 4mm are wrong, write 40 m, 4 mm Line 66. MATERIAL AND METHODS / EXPERIMENTAL DETAILS / METHODOLOGY Choose only one item! Line 68, 6.000: It is better to write 6,000 Lines 76-79. - Correct the writing of numbers with decimals! pH 4,2, 4,2 (Replace the comma with the dot/point). Ditto for 17,10; 1,07; 0,25; 0,09 etc. - Are the abbreviations t, T, SB and P-rem conventional? Line 83. P2O5 is wrong. Write P₂O₅ Line 95. Correct the sentence! Line 109. 1L 1 L Line 112. 6cm 6 cm Lines 132-133. Each plot was constituted by one seedling. Is it statistically correct? Line 161. What is the unit of measurement of height? cm or cm²? Lines 225-230. This work has no prospects. Lines 232-336. References are poorly written. Authors must follow the guidelines for writing references.	All recommendations have been met and are duly highlighted. Concerning "Lines 132-133. Each plot was constituted by one seedling. Is it statistically correct?": Yes, it is. The same plot design can be seen at works (all in Portuguese) such as: Oliveira, Hiroce & Boaventura (1986) http://www.scielo.br/pdf/brag/v45n1/18.pdf; Silva, Gomes, Santos & Nascimento (2017) https://www.embrapa.br/busca-de-publicacoes/-/publicacao/1082061/producao-de-porta-enxerto-de-muricizeiro-byrsonima-crassifolia-l-hbk-com-diferentes-concentracoes-de-nutrientes; Silva & Nascimento (2016) https://www.embrapa.br/amazonia-oriental/busca-de-publicacoes/-/publicacao/1053963/substratos-para-producao-de-mudas-de-camucamuzeiro; Carvalho et al (2017) http://www.coffeescience.ufla.br/index.php/Coffeescience/article/view/1175
Minor REVISION comments	Good manuscript! The absence of sterilization of the soil is in my opinion a methodological bias. Because even if there had been a positive effect of AMFs, it would not necessarily have been attributed to AMFs; because the soil abounds with a panoply of microorganisms susceptible to improve the plants growth. And, the fact that there was no effect does not mean that the AMFs used do not have an effect on plant growth. Competition between microorganisms present in the soil and those inoculated can explain the obtained result. In addition, such AMF / AMF composite can enhance growth and such other (s) no.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	