



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_43648
Title of the Manuscript:	Growth, Gas Exchange and Mineral Nutrition of Xaraés Grass (Brachiaria Brizantha cv. Xaraés) in a Haplic Cambisol with Increasing Copper Doses
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	- The Keywords are missing: copper - Sufficient presentation and reviews had been shown in the introduction chapter. - The methods used for experiments and data analysis are up to date, but missing the method of soil sampling! - Good results had been derived, generated and highlighted! - The all references are relevant and adequate.	The word "copper" is already in the title of the manuscript, and there is no need to repeat it in the keywords. Agreed.
Minor REVISION comments	- Fig. 6 (the second pic) isn't there (black diagram) - In the chapter of discussion: Or under or upper the figure be the text (confused).	Agreed. Agreed. The chapter "Results and Discussion" was divided into 2 different chapters: "Results" and "Discussion", so that the text of each variable in the Results chapter was written before each figure or table to which it refers, and the Discussion chapter was written in a separate chapter.
Optional/General comments	- Very interesting and thorough work! - Since this experiment is a one-year study in a single environment, further research years are warranted to confirm the present results	

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>

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	