SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

**SDI Review Form 1.6**

| | |
|---|---|
| Journal Name: | **Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International** |
| Manuscript Number: | **Ms_JAERI_22186** |
| Title of the Manuscript: | **Glyphosate influence on the soil microorganism sensibility, physiological parameters of the plant, isoflavones and residues in the seeds and soil** |
| 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 | *The **Abstract** is not written according to the standards of the journal (items: aims, study design, place and duration of the study, methodology, results and conclusion). However, the abstract is clear and precise. I suggest to add the missing items in the "Abstract" to be more complete information (e.g. duration of the study).*<br><br>***Introduction**. I think that Introduction is understandable, clear and comprehensive exposing the reader to the topic. Purpose and objective are scientifically appropriate.*<br><br>***Material and Methods**. OK. Very complete writing. The methodology used is correctly described. So described it allow experiment to be reproduced.*<br><br>***Results and Discussion**: OK. I think the experimental results are thoroughly and logically interpreted in the discussion and presented with clarity. Author compared the results obtained with the experiments and results of previous studies on the relevant subject. For this reason, I believe that this section is well written.*<br><br>***Conclusion.** Ok.* | |
| **Minor** REVISION comments | *The Bibliography you must cite according to the "Rules of Writing Magazine." You should put italics the names of botanical species.* | |

**SDI Review Form 1.6**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Optional/General** comments | *Some corrections should be done on the content and form before its publication.* | |

**Reviewer Details:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Name: | ***Petigrosso, Lucas Ricardo*** |
| Department, University & Country | ***Universidad Nacional de Mar del Plata, Argentina*** |