



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_40201
Title of the Manuscript:	Foliar Fertilization Using Liquid Tannery Sludge In Conilon Coffee Seedlings Production
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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The English language of manuscript present several errors, a revision by native professional will be need. In introduction, there are several problems with some affirmations, for example this paragraph: - "Thus, the use of potentially pollutant residues from an industrial process is an interesting alternative for the substrate and/or conventional fertilizer". If a waste is pollutant, it can not be applied in agricultural soils. The authors need modify the way that this information is written. This manuscript presents serious problems in description of experimental design. The doses are presented in volume of tannery waste diluted in water. However, there are no mention about the total amount of diluted tannery sludge applied in each treatment during this study. The authors described the irrigation and, after, a description of foliar fertilization was done, making confuse the understanding of reader. The limiting factor for doses calculation was not described in Material and Methods. The amount of nutrients and contaminants provided by doses studied were not presented. How was the foliar application done? Was it done by irrigation system? What was the total amount of tannery diluted applied in each treatment? Why was the dilution of tannery sludge done? Was there some problem due to salts presence? The authors discussed about the significance of results. However, they was no present the p value of each regression model. The authors justified the results obtained based in nutrients or contaminants provided by tannery diluted. However, there was no table containing information about the amount of nutrients or contaminants provided, which should be used to support the authors statements. Thus, the most of manuscript conclusions were based on assumptions about the nutrients and contaminants amounts provided to plants. Additionally, more than half of references used in this manuscript are in Portuguese. Likewise, it is important a literature review in international journals.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The manuscript reformulation is strictly necessary, correction the presented problems, so the manuscript can be evaluated in another submission.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Sarah Mello Leite Moretti</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Brazil</i>