

[Review Form 2](#)

Book Name:	Innovations in Biological Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_1792
Title of the Manuscript:	ROLE OF VESICULAR-ARBUSCULAR MYCORRHIZAL FUNGI ON RICE CROP WITH DIFFERENT DOSE OF FERTILIZER TO SAVE SUSTAINABILITY
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is written on a good subject, but the quality of the English needs to be improved. The aim of the study should be provided in the introduction. Some sentences are long and similar. The genera of VAM fungi have not been provided. Information on statistical analysis methods and software is not provided. Studies by other authors are missing from the discussion. As the manuscript is a book chapter, you should include a figure showing the interactions between the rice plant and the VAM is provided.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of the article is suitable	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive. In my opinion, treatments T2 and T5 should be compared, and not T1, since the aim of the study is to demonstrate the role of AMF.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsection of the methodology lacks how the measurements were made, what methods were used in the nutrient composition of the plant tissues, as well as statistical analysis	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound, because microorganisms are nowadays used in the form of biopesticides, biofertilisers, bioremediations have attracted the attention of many researchers, in a context of environmental protection, production of quality products. So, with the world's population growing, this alternative method is being combined with other integrated pest management strategies. These micro-organisms (AMF) help to reduce dependence on synthetic fertilisers.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	the references are recent, but not sufficient because there is no reference in the discussion section.	
Minor REVISION comments	English quality of the article needs to be improved	
Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yaya Kone
Department, University & Country	Institut D'economie Rurale (IER), Mali