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	1. Abstract: In result, the significant level must be writen p<0.01 or p<0.05? 2. Line 17-18: Recommended to merged to one sentences. Examples : Parkia nitida, a leguminous tree, can be.....to achieve several of these goals because these plant have great economic and ecological importance. 3. The reference of sentence in line 21-22 must be written: Exp: "It is a large tree that can reach up to 40 m..... (.....)". The same thing, sentences need to be supported by literature: line 41, 47, 62, 195. 4. Introduction must be sharpened with more new relevant literature: relevant literatur on AMF application and P of Parkia nitida in the nursery. The author needs to read a lot of relevant journal to support the title 5. Novelty of work must be indicated in line 63-64. 6. Authors must be add authors reference - Line 72 [18], ..." trait adapted from Santos et al (2017), " - Line 90, reference of [23] ; "Seed dormancy breaking was adapted from Brito et al (2017)", - Line 104, reference of [26]: "Germination speed for 10 days was close to the value obtained by the regression model from observations by Cruz et al. (2001)". - Line 127, reference of [11] "..based on previously experiment by Lacerdo et al. (2011)", - Line 164, reference of [25] "...the one described previously by Shimizu et al. (2011) " 7. Suggested removed the sentences "However, germination time could be expanded ... even for high rates' from the material and methods / experimental details / methodology section. Line 105-107. 8. Sugested removed the sentence/paragraph in line 116-124 from the material and methods / experimental details / methodology section and placed in discussion section. 9. The author needs to show / write basic (support relevant literature) for the application of mycorrhizae (5 ml of inoculum soil) ?? 10. The graphs in Figures 1 and 2 should be changed in bar form and display the standard deviation of each bar for each observation (height and height/diameter per doses of P). 11. Rearrange the sentence that states citation of references: - Line 167: "This finding in in line with Vasconcellos et al (2001) reported that...." - Line 173-174: " According to Campos et al. (2002) ....." - Line 185-186: "This finding is in line with Rodrigues et al. (2003) reported that...." - Line 192-193: "These result are consistent with the finding of research by Gomes et al. (2002) that...." - Line 204-205: " The result of this study indicated that...." - Line 212:"This indicated that..." - Line 215:"According to Azevedo et al. (2010)...." 12. Discussion section need to be sharpened/extended with more new relevant literatur. Examples: the result of treatment doses of P and AMF need to be compare with new relevant on journal. 13. In the conclusions of the novelty of the research (work) it is necessary to mention how many optimal doses of P?	Recommendations have been met and are duly highlighted. Recommendation 4*: "Introduction must be sharpened with more new relevant literature: relevant literatur on AMF application and P of Parkia nitida in the nursery."* There is not my studies relating AMF and P to the development of *Parkia nitida*, therefore, the author incorporated new literature concerning AMF and P application on different plants. Recommendation 8: *"Sugested removed the sentence/paragraph in line 116-124 from the material and methods / experimental details / methodology section and placed in discussion section."* The authors believe that the text best represents a methodological procedure rather than a part of the discussion. It is preferred to keep on materials and methods. Recommendation 10: *"The graphs in Figures 1 and 2 should be changed in bar form and display the standard deviation of each bar for each observation (height and height/diameter per doses of P)."* The dispersion graphs were used because they are directly related to the references described in the text, in this sense, it is preferred to maintain them.
Minor REVISION comments	1. Removed the word "Also" at the beginning of the sentence on line 159 2. Adjust the standard writing unit in SI, change mL to ml. Line 113.	Recommendations have been met and are duly highlighted.

	3. The reference section must completely be cross checked against text to avoid extraor missing references. It must also be checked one by one for accuracy and consistency against journal roles.	
Optional/General comments	Add the Acknowledgments	

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)*	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link: http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20