



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_50999
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFICIENT MICROORGANISMS APPLIED TO THE SOIL AND IN COVER ON THE QUINOA CROP ( <i>Chenopodium quinoa</i> )
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>- There is no need to add the scientific name of quinoa in the title and if it is a must the researcher have to add as (<i>Chenopodium quinoa</i> Willd.)</p> <p>-The name of quinoa accession which used in this trail not mentioned,</p> <p>-the fertilization recommendations which can be used by farmer not mentioned (can be used as control),</p> <p>the control not included any mineral fertilization (it is common ?).</p> <p>- The experimental design which appeared in this paper is factorial RCBD, That mean 4 treatments from factor A x 4 treatments from factor B = 16 treatments without the control.</p> <p>May it is only RCBD and not factorial (4 soil treatments + 4 foliar treatments + control = 9treatments) or</p> <p>It is need more clarification if he describe them as factorial trial it can be (5x5 treatments):</p> <p>Factor A: (without =0 as control, 3, 6, 9 and 12%)</p> <p>Factor B: (0, 3, 6, 9 and 12%)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Seeds were manually sowed, adding 12 seed per pot at a 5 cm depth (the researcher have to mention why this big number of seeds may the germination of the accession used was low?) &amp; also why 5cm is the depth of planting while seeds size is very small only about 2mm (the depth of planting depending on the seed size).</li> <li>- It will be good if the control appeared in figures.</li> <li>- Please clarify the production in the table (grain or seed yield / pot or per plant)</li> <li>- May also if additional data are available like 1000-grain weight, protein content, saponin content (EM may affect the quinoa quality also).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- We removed the scientific name from the title</li> <li>- Since there are still researches being made with the quinoa, there is still no name for the variety.</li> <li>- The recommendation of a base fertilization was added to the material and methods.</li> <li>- We tried to clarify the treatments, there were four main treatments, the dilutions from 0 up to 12% of EM. Each treatment had, or not, the application of EM on the leaves, being then considered a second factor (with or without), and the additional treatment was used as the main control because it was the quinoa alone without any application of EM.</li> <li>- We are sorry, there was a mistake with the number of seeds previously sown in the experiment and also a typo with the depth. The correct amount of seeds was of 6, being then thinned to 3, and a depth of 2 cm.</li> <li>- Is there a problem if the control is only a straight line? Because there is only one value for it. Also, the control is mentioned in Table 1 being it compared to the other two methods (dilutions + foliar application or not of EM).</li> <li>- Sadly, we haven't measured other parameters than these ones. But we appreciate your idea and sure we will consider doing it in future researches.</li> </ul>



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	