



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_45287
Title of the Manuscript:	Nutrient contents in a Cerrado oxisol fertilized with swine liquid manure under an environmental conservation perspective
Type of the 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 abstract - Conama. Were collected (pls grammar check) Intro- should express the long term of MT (for the first expression) Figure 1, Table 1, 2 & 3 should be in the section of results and discussion. cmol_c and cmol_c ??? (same or not ??). Mg²⁺ or Mg⁺² ???	Ajusted. These data are in material and methods because they have been used as tools to obtain the data analyzed statistically. These data of Fig. 1 tables 1, 2 and 3 are data on the conditions of the area, soil and amounts of biofertilizers to be applied, however, they were presented as support for understanding the previous state of research, so they were not discussed because they were not analyzed statistically, however I suggest leaving them in the material and methods as understanding tools and not specifically as main data of the results analyzed by the statistic. Ajusted.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	All references should follow the reference style of Journal.	Right.

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)	No there is.
If plagiarism is suspected, please provide related proofs or web links.	https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/ar https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/ar https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Water_supp https://www.slideshare.net/GhassanHadi/e http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=s http://agrienvarchive.ca/bioenergy/hems/ http://www.fao.org/docrep/004/ab986e/ab9 http://www.bworldonline.com/content.php? https://link.springer.com/article/10.100	All the suggestions were adhered to and the whole reference was reviewed with care.

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>