



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_43230
Title of the Manuscript:	Phosphorus uptake and use efficiency in Brazilian soybean cultivars
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		
Minor REVISION comments	1. Add some photographs of root morphology and root distribution or root architecture after P application 2. Please check your DOI system. Ensure that your DOI is true 3. Most of your references were too old or more than 7 years. Please change with the new one 4. It is better you elaborate about cultivars. Why some cultivar has good response to P both uptake and use efficiency. 5. What is the relationship between root morphology and P uptake or root architecture and P use efficiency.	1. Unfortunately, we have no picture available. 2. I checked the DOI System of all references and ensured that each one is true. 3. The paper references are old because the work was done using the radioisotope ³²P technique, which is very expensive, requires specialized training and several permissions to be used. For this reason, only few studies use this technique with the same purpose of our paper. Similarly, the techniques for assessing the root system are extremely hard working, and few scientists are willing to use them. Furthermore, some references (e.g. 3, 4 and 10) are part of the basic literature, since they established the methodologies. 4. The corrections were made - lines 353-367 5. The proposal of the second experiment was to relate root traits and P uptake efficiency, not with use efficiency. A better discussion about the relationship between root morphology and P uptake was made in lines 383-390.
Optional/General comments	Acceptable to publish this paper	Thank you so much for the suggestions! I checked the link http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20, and the references are in accordance with reference style.

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>