



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	In the topic; 'addition' should be 'addition'. In the topic; 'of' should be place in between different and doses.	The spelling corrections were made.
Minor REVISION comments	Can the author(s) provide sub themes in the main text to make easy reading? For evample under matrials and mthods you could have subthemes like; study site, experimental desgn, coating procedure, determination of certain parameters etc with their respective analytical standards. References: 1. In the main text represent each reference with a number in parenthesis according to Author's instruction of this journal 2. In the reference list some of the initials of the authors are in small letters. Please check all and correct them accordingly. 3. The following are in the in text but not in reference list: Xavier et al 2015 Pesoa et al 2000 Ziaeyan et al 2009 Marschner, 1991 4. Brazil 2009 should be Bra <u>s</u> il 2009 5. Line 322 Acs, Luchese B, Luchese V is in the reference list but in the main text.	The suggestions of subdivisions in topics were followed. The references were corrected and adapted to the norms of the journal.
Optional/General comments	This was a factorial design with factors (factor 1- 2 methods, factor 2-coating doses) making it 2x4 factorial CRD. You would have gotten an interaction from the statistical analysis.Why did you not use this design instead? Well-written paper and can be considered for publication after these corrections.	It was not possible to perform statistical analysis in factorial, since the experiment was not set up in a factorial scheme but as independent treatments. The doses of boron and zinc were combined to form a treatment, since the requirements of both for the plants are different, however there were no multiple combinations. Another factor for this design was that the objective of the study was to know the best treatment tested and the best method of adding micronutrients. Thus, the analysis in individual treatments was the best and most rigorous option.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

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>