



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_41211
Title of the Manuscript:	SPACIAL VARIABILITY OF KENWORTHY BALANCED INDEXES (KBI) FOR MACRO AND MICRONUTRIENTS ON THE COFFEE CANEPHORA
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	ABSTRACT. - Knowledge gaps, measured parameters and data analysis method are missing within the abstract. - In the abstract indicate the GPRS location of the study site. - Proof-reading of the abstract recommended to correct syntax. - Ensure that the abstract is a representative of the whole paper in summary with all essential features. INTRODUCTION Lines 44, is the word, 'kind' same as 'variety' if so then use, 'variety' instead, Line 47 and 50, should be re-written to correct syntax. N/B: Proof reading of the entire section recommended. Write short and precise sentences. The word, 'et al' should be italicized in all citations. Some fundamental statements are lacking authorities, this amounts to plagiarism. Materials and methods - This section is too length and not clear. Reduce the wording and be precise.	All the recommendations were followed. The Abstract was modified according to the Reviewer notes. The term in the Introduction was modified and de section "Materials and methods" was re-read in order to verify whether there was a paragraph that's difficult to understand. To verify if there were any copy, the software "CopySpider" has been used, showing that less than 1.8% of coincidence, not showing plagiarism in this article.
Minor REVISION comments	This article is fairly well written. English syntax errors have been detected in the text. Re-reading of the manuscript is recommended. This manuscript is recommended for minor revision.	The article has been reviewed by an English native speaker.
Optional/General comments		