



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_54633
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Synergistic Effects of Vermicompost and Beneficial Microbes on Pea
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>1) Materials and Methods, 2.1 Evaluation of effects of vermicompost..... : Authors should specify the size of plastic pots which they used in their work.</p> <p>2) Topic of 2.1: Lack the details of caring after planting. Thus, authors should add their details in this section.</p> <p>3) Topic of 2.1: sterilized in autoclave at 121°C should be changed to sterilized in autoclave at 121°. What's the unit of temperature?.</p> <p>4) What's the variety of pea seed which they used in their work?.</p> <p>5) For vermicompost treating, authors should write more contents as follows: 5.1 How did they get this? 5.2 How did they treat vermicompost with pea seed?.</p> <p>6) For microbe treating, authors should write more contents as follows: 6.1 How did they get these two microbes? 6.2 How did they treat these two microbest with pea seed?.</p> <p>7) Data record for plant growth: Authors should write more details that when did they record these characteristics?.</p> <p>8) Discussions: Authors should write more discussion as follows: 8.1 How did the interaction effects of vermicompost and microbe, especially <i>T. harzianum</i> for promoting pea growth?. 8.2 Why did the interaction effects of vermicompost and <i>P. fluorescens</i> show the less promoter than <i>T. harzianum</i> for pea growth?. 8.3 Why did the interaction roles of vermicompost and two microbes affect to the contents of TPC, PAL activity and PO activity?. 8.4 Authors should discuss their results from Fig A (1-6) link to Fig B (1-3). Are they consistent or not?.</p> <p>9) Please check the accuracy of alphabet, which showed the statistical differences as circle. Is it correct?.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1) 3.1 Growth parameters: promotion activities might be duo to should be changed to promotion activities might be due to</p> <p>2) Reference list number 6: Trichoderma spp. change to <i>Trichoderma</i> spp.</p>	
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Benjawan Chutichudet
Department, University & Country	Faculty of Technology, Maharakham University, Thailand