

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_127237
Title of the Manuscript:	The combined effect of Arbuscular Mycorrhizal Fungi and Arsenic doses on Oxidative stress of Leuceana leucocephala in Nursery
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The study aimed to evaluate the effects of different levels of arsenic toxicity and the application of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF) to alleviate the oxidative stress on the woody legume <i>L. leucocephala</i> . Such studies is important due to potential health implications of arsenic contamination especially <i>L. leucocephala</i> is commonly used for fodder. The work is not far from the scope of the journal.	Noted
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	Thanks
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract needs to be restructured, It should cover the treatment, since it is a manipulative experiment separating independent from dependent variables, followed by promising results. In the current for it is not quite clear	Noted
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No, In the methodology a subsection should explain the origin of the mycorrhizae, the inoculation detail (propagules, hyphae, spore numbers etc..) and the most important the root staining and estimation of root colonization In results as well as the discussion: colonization rate, antioxidants, and the content of arsenic and phosphorus in roots and shoots should be separated	OK
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	A lot of laboratorial and field work have been done with an innovative idea to induce seedling to different concentration of arsenic and inoculated with 2 species of AMF, However, important parameters are missing such as the root colonization rate, the way of estimation the phosphorus in plant parts.	Done revision
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	A proofread will correct typos and spelling errors and improves the structure and readability of manuscript	Done
Optional/General comments	The Introduction is not structured well, it should start from general info about the experimental plant, high levels arsenic in soil and its environmental and health implications, then the AMF and finally the idea of inoculation and the expectations The methodology lacks the data analysis too. A conclusion part needed to summarize the outcome, indicate weaknesses and add recommendations	Noted

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)	