



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_43968
Title of the Manuscript:	METHODOLOGY OF ADITION OF DIFFERENT DOSES BORON AND ZINC IN THE COATING OF PERENNIAL SOYBEAN SEEDS
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 manuscript is not clear with major revision required specifying clear objectives and the implications of the study conducted and what would the effect and applicability. Several References are missing. The references written do not follow a rule, it's quite erratic. Spelling check and grammar should be properly checked.	The correct spelling corrections were made and the references were formatted according to the norms of the journal.
Minor REVISION comments	The tables and the figures should be mentioned in order in the text with description in relevant areas.	The tables and figures were inserted as mentioned. However, some figures and tables are again quoted out of order, due to the need to act as a reference in the discussions..
Optional/General comments	The sentences could be concise to the point instead of big sentences leading nowhere.	accepted suggestion

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)	

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>