



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_49931
Title of the Manuscript:	COPROLITES PRODUCTION OF NATIVE EARTHWORMS IN BRAQUIARIA FIELDS UNDER BIOFERTILIZATION
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>INTRODUCTION Add the information on the physicochemical characteristics of soils and the characteristics of geophagous" native earthworm coprolites in a Yellow Oxisol area, in the city of Areia-PB, under the pastures of Brachiaria grasses,</p> <p>MATERIAL AND METHODS Specify: the geographical coordinates; the climatic data (rainfall, relative humidity, air temperature, soil temperature, and solar radiation); the vegetation and the altitude of the study area. Specify the measured variables. Specify the type of applied ANOVA and the multiple tests mean comparisons (Duncan test, for example). The results of Table 1 on "Coprolites production of native earthworms under Brachiaria pastures during the drought season", lack of statistical support. It is advisable to add the values of standard deviations to the data. The methodology raises "A randomized complete block design, with subdivided plots and four replicates. The factorial arrangement used is 5 x 3 x 2, with five species of grasses, three sampling times in with and without liquid-enriched bio-fertilization", however, the results of Tables 2 and 3 are not congruent with the proposed methodology. We have not observed the interaction effects between species with the bio-fertilizer application or between sampling time and species. The data were not analyzed under a factorial arrangement, nor were applied the Duncan multiple comparisons of means for the species and treatments.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<p>ABSTRACT Change "of 50.0 m² (10.0 m x 5.0 m) with" to "of 50 m² (10 x 5 m) with" Specify the measured variables. Publicize in terms of number, the outstanding results on the production of native earthworms in function of the treatments. Keywords: add the following words to the keywords: Production, earthworms, pasture. Change "following the methodological procedures of [15]" to "following the methodological procedures of EMBRAPA, [15]". RESULTS AND DISCUSSION Add the names of the authors followed by the number, for example: In this sense, Kanianska et al., [12], found that.... Saha et al., [17] reported that seasonal variation.... Sales, [18] observed that in the dry season...., Ortiz-Gamino et al., [19], points.. Change "According to [20], some earthworm species...." to "According to silva et al., [20], some earthworm species...." For the following paragraph add the values of significance (p) and the names of the authors: In the second sampling (Table 2), no significant differences were observed between the fertilization treatments, but significant differences (p=???) between the Brachiaria</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	species... In the third sampling, the coprolites production was not influenced by the treatments with fertilization, significant differences (P=???) between the form of coprolites. Fiuza et al. , [21] emphasized the importance of.... According to Silva et al. , [22], the..	
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rahim Foroughbakhch
Department, University & Country	Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León, Mexico