



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_48741
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungal inoculation on growth and yield of two sweet potato varieties
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	<p>Lines 51 to 52 : arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF) do not produce or secrete organic acid to solitize phosphorus. For the moment, no study has shown that AMF solubilize phosphorus. Reference 11, which is the case here, does not deal with AMF but rather with ericoid mycorrhizal (ErM) and ectomycorrhizal (EcM) fungi. This part is therefore to be seriously revised because the author seems to confuse AMF, erM and ecM which are fundamentally different.</p> <p>Line 55 : "efficient nutrient acquisition in infertile soils", it is rather the acquisition of nutrients in less fertile soils because the AMF only mobilize the little available nutrient in the soil because of the increase of the contact surface by the hyphae of the AMF. Therefore, in infertile soil (without nutrients), AMF will not be able to improve the mineral nutrition of plants. It is important that the introduction be rewritten supported by a rich bibliography because the author confuses things that seem elementary but fundamental for AMF.</p> <p>Lines 70 to 72: The inoculum consisted of <i>Rhizophagus irregularis</i>, <i>Funneliformis mosseae</i>, <i>Claroideoglomus claroideum</i> and <i>Claroideoglomus etunicatum</i> AMF species (with and without inoculation). delete " with and without inoculation"</p> <p>Line 75 : The experiment had a total of 8 treatments which were replicated three times. Write " The experiment had a total of 8 treatments. Each treatment was replicated three times."</p> <p>The number of repetitions is low. Three repetitions is the minimum number of repetitions. For in situ tests, it would be more interesting to do at least five repetitions per treatment to have detectable results.</p> <p>Lines 86 to 87: The yield parameters: Marketable storage root yield and shoots biomass were determined. Write " the yield parameters (Marketable storage root yield and shoots biomass) were determined"</p> <p>Line 104 : Since the objective of the study is not to compare production between two varieties of sweet potato, but rather to evaluate the response to mycorrhizal inoculation of sweet potato, it is not necessary to multi-factor ANOVA but rather a one-factor ANOVA. Thus, each potato variety will be analyzed separately for treatment, inoculated and no inoculated. Take again Table 1 doing a one-way ANOVA.</p> <p>Lines 135 to 136 and 163 to 164 : Same as for table 1</p> <p>Lines 126 to 128 : If for a parameter the statistical analysis does not show significant differences between the different treatments, then we no longer value high values. It simply says that the treatment had no effect on the parameter.</p>	<p>Revised</p> <p>Revised</p> <p>Deleted</p> <p>Revised</p> <p>For this experiment we managed the 3 replications, which is the minimum acceptable statistically</p> <p>Revised</p> <p>We compared the two since kemb-10 is an improved variety while Bungoma is a landrace variety. To this end the data analysis is fine. Comparison of the two varieties has serious practical significance since it is from such results that we can convince farmers to make a choice between the two. In any case when the interactions are significant, it is obvious and implied that one-way ANOVA is significant – but not always the other way round. ***For this reason, we request not to analyse each variety separately.</p> <p>Revised</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Lines 43 to 45 : Associate with a broad range of species and are more widely distributed</p>	<p>Revised</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>than other types of mycorrhizal associations. Give the bibliographic reference of this statement. Refresh bibliographic references because those used in this manuscript are usually too old. Preferably use items up to 5 years old. In addition, add the DOI references whenever possible as the case of reference 11, for example.</p> <p>Line 70 : "mixed commercial inoculum" write instead " mycorrhizal mixed commercial inoculum"</p> <p>Line 89: why the one weighing more than 100 g only?</p>	<p>Revised</p> <p>This is the recommended standard market weight of sweet potato roots in our country.</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>This manuscript cannot be published in the state In general, this manuscript must be rewritten by supporting it with more recent articles (up to 5 years old if possible) and the statistical analyzes must also be redone (one-way ANOVA). Which means that the discussion will also be redone. This will lead to a new conclusion.</p>	<p>We have worked on all the major areas you raised. We are therefore requesting you to allow our manuscript to be published. Thank you</p>

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	NONE