



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>)

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>Good and well articulated original research paper very much fit for publication by JAERI. However, the following points should be looked into before the paper is considered for publication:</p> <p>Firstly, at the level of the introduction, the main and specific objectives of the study should be highlighted. This should be done at the end of the introduction. Doing this will permit the reader to know what to expect at the level of the methodology and results.</p> <p>Secondly, the discussion of the study's findings should be improved. This should be done by consulting the works of more authors who have conducted related research (preferably the most recent publications) and using them to discuss the findings of the paper. This should be done in a more comparative fashion i.e. comparing and contrasting their findings with the findings of this study. Doing this will give the findings of the paper more relevance and scientific robustness.</p> <p>Last but no the least, the conclusion should be more detailed and some policy implications of the findings of the study should be highlighted.</p>	<p>Corrected</p> <p>Corrected</p> <p>Corrected</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Good original research paper almost ripe for publication. However, the aforementioned comments and evaluations should be taken into account in the revised manuscript before the paper is considered for publication.	All the raised issues have been taken into account.

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)	