



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_53471
Title of the Manuscript:	Effectiveness of Azospirillum brasilense inoculants to wheat (<i>Triticum aestivum</i>) in the micro-region of Curitiba (SC).
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>General comments: The article deals with an important agricultural subject, relevant to the international community but describe an assay to a micro-region.....; But it is the result of a single experiment; only on cultivar; conducted under field conditions; only one place; only one growing season; only one place/region. It does clearly write the hypothesis; It does clearly write the work aim. The writing must be revised in a depth English scientific style (grammar, orthography, American or British...) Must be revise all symbols and abbreviations, like Trio x TBIO, etc... The article is not properly formatted according to the template available on the journal's website. Very oldest citation and references from 1995 to 2018, a gap of good international articles (with journal impacts). The assay carried out a xxx growing season (lack date); Lack important information's about assay managements Lack important information's traits evaluated (more details and descriptions)</p> <p>The authors must be checking rigorously the authors guidelines; In general, the results are fragile to a robust and categoric conclusions showed The experiment performed lack an innovative scientific news.</p> <p>ABSTRACT – lack an informative numeric relevant about traits measured; but there is writing the objective in a clear manner.</p> <p>INTRODUCTION-writing in a good structure, actual citations and references, but are so short, only two paragraphs.</p> <p>METHODOLOGY- reorganize the text and topics (see guidelines and as a word template). Reorder as a logical or chronological procedure. Lack a writing the grain yield potential as function of all management practices. Statistical analysis: robust and elegant procedure are applied. Lack writing in split in a main topic, as subtitles, as a template... Lack described/detailed all management practices performed. Lack described/detailed about the traits evaluated and procedures performed. Statistical analysis: robust and elegant procedure are applied. Lack the climatic information's, like temperatures, rainfall, solar radiation during plant growth...</p> <p>RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS... The citations not follow authors guidelines, see recent published article or template. The figures are showed as 3D, but it's not necessary, because effective and technical at 2D, y and x axes. (not Z) All article the citation and references not according to authors guidelines/authors instruction.... The authors must revise particularly data's on figure 1, about dry weight, grain yield, are very low...</p> <p>REFERENCES: bad adjust to authors guidelines and references rules, see template...</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Clovis Arruda De Souza
Department, University & Country	Santa Catarina State University (UDESC), Brazil