

Dear author/authors;

The study conducted is suitable for publication, original, and interesting. However, there are some deficiencies, both generally and specifically in the manuscript sections, as noted below. Addressing these deficiencies will make the study publishable. In the introduction section of the manuscript, sentences have been used that imply the study is local. The study was conducted to contribute to solving a global problem, not just a local one. These sentences in the abstract and introduction should be replaced with general statements. Another deficiency is the lack of tables/graphs showing the effects of mycorrhiza and phosphorus applications individually and in combination. Adding these and discussing them in the context of the literature will make the manuscript clearer and more comprehensive.

Best regards.

Abstract

Phosphorus deficiency limits productivity not only in South African soils but in all soils in the world. Therefore, global rather than local expressions should be used. The study conducted and the results obtained appear to be universal rather than local. I recommend using appropriate sentences reflecting this in the abstract and introduction sections.

Keywords

The words used in the title should not be used in the keywords. Additionally, the keywords should be listed in alphabetical order.

Introduction

The introduction section of the manuscript is generally well written. The cited sources should be original research articles rather than reviews. Some sentences used are similar to the sentences cited by the referenced sources. As previously mentioned, the writing should be in a global context. Since the study is not specific to South Africa, you should discuss the global situation of the issue, not just the situation in your country. Additionally, providing information on the effects of mycorrhiza and phosphorus or microorganisms and nutrients on time-dependent changes in plant height, stem diameter, and chlorophyll observed in the study, if available in the literature, will enhance the quality of the manuscript.

Lines 41-53: When discussing animal feed production and phosphorus deficiency in soils, which is a problem not only for South Africa but for the entire world, global statements should be used.

Line 48: I think it should be "Davis et al.", not "Davies et al."

Materials & Methods

The Materials and Methods section is well-written, but there are some deficiencies. Addressing these deficiencies will make the manuscript publishable. Additionally, as understood from Lines 84-89, only one pot was used in each replicate. This reduces the statistical reliability of the study to some extent. However, the cultivation of 2 plants per pot partially mitigates this deficiency.

Line 94: The proportions of the species included in the mycorrhiza mixture used should be specified.

Line 94: The method of applying mycorrhizae to the seeds and/or soil should be explained in more detail.

Line 95: The method of calculating the fertilizer amount used per hectare for each pot should be clearly specified. Was it based on volume, surface area, or another method? Please provide detailed information.

Line 96: Is the depth of the pot and the soil inside the pot correctly stated? If not, it should be corrected. If it is correct, an explanation should be provided on how the seeds were sown at a depth of 4-6 cm as mentioned in Line 97 and at what depth the plant roots grew.

Line 103: Information about other fertilizers given to the plants should be provided.

Results and Discussion

The results are well-written, clear, and sufficient according to the tables in the manuscript. However, tables examining the individual and dual combination effects of cultivar, mycorrhiza, and phosphorus fertilizer (cultivar x mycorrhiza, cultivar x phosphorus, mycorrhiza x phosphorus) are missing. These tables need to be added. This will allow for the observation of the individual, dual, and triple effects of the applications.

Lines 186-187: The information in the mentioned lines was not produced in the referenced study. The study cited as "Tobisa & Uchida, 2017" similarly references other studies in a similar sentence. Similarly, citations should be made to the original studies where the work was conducted.

Lines 188-190: In the relevant lines, the phrase "several previous studies" is used, but only one study is cited. It is unclear which studies are being referred to. References to the relevant studies should be provided at the end of the sentence.

Lines 190-192: In your study, mycorrhiza was found to be more effective at a phosphorus dose of 40 kg P/ha. This finding needs to be discussed more effectively with the literature.

Lines 203-221: The brave claims in the relevant lines need to be discussed with the literature.

Lines 221-224: If sentences are taken from the same study, it is sufficient to cite it once at the end of the last sentence.