SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Experimental Agriculture International**
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_36768
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance of Campo Grande stylers seeds coated with different layers
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

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	Need to specify the treatments in the abstract as well as what do you mean with "physiological characteristics" and "development". When you discuss your data you need to specify the "p-value" every time you make implications of differences among treatments, not only in few cases. Include the p-value of the model in Tables 1, 2 and 3 for each variable. Include the value used for comparisons for each variable Tables 1, 2 and 3. Use the same number of decimals in a Table. For example, in Table 2 use 3.0 and not 3. In all tables, when titles of several columns have the same unit (example %), do not repeat the unit for each column… instead add another line below those titles and put the unit only once but covering for all columns as needed. You need to develop more your conclusions and do not need to write them as separate sentences. Need to work on your REFERENCES. Some are incomplete, others have errors.	All corrections were made.
Minor REVISION comments	Include de scientific name in the title. Avoid using terms such as "in order to" and go directly to "to". Is it "papel roll" or "paper roll". There are some sentences where the "source" needs to be cited in the introduction part. When you refer to a nutrient use the symbol instead the name. For example "N" and not "nitrogen"… revise similar errors. Separate the unit symbol from the number (only % is the exception). For example "25 g" and not "25g"… revise similar errors. Use "8 h" instead of "eight hours"… revise similar errors. I think specific details of the formula are needed instead of only the reference on lines 94 and 102. Specify the proportion of sifted and sand in line 100. Use decimals only if necessary; but I highly suggest rounding the data. For example "14%" instead of "14.11%"… revise the whole document. You don't need to mention "tukey test" in the Results and Discussion part. Do not write like this "In Table 2 it can be observed….". Write like this "The germination data…. (Tabla 2)". Revise the whole document.	All corrections were made.
Optional/General comments	It is necessary to review the writing of the document as there are some misspelling and writing errors. I suggest using LSD instead of Tukey for means separation as LSD usually offers better results.	The Tukey's test was used because of the results in the confidence interval of the same size samples with two to two differences. This means that if two-way comparisons are made the Tukey test can be used and will result in shorter intervals than any other one-step multiple comparison method being a more stringent test than the LSD test.