



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Experimental Agriculture International |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JEAI_48521 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Reduction of pathogens in palisade grass seeds by contact with fertilizer |
| 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) |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| Compulsory REVISION comments | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The topic should read "Effect of fertilizer on pathogens in Paliside grass seeds". 2. The fungi isolated in the research should be presented pictorially in the body of the manuscript. The pictures of the fungi should be placed as figures in the manuscript. 3. There is supposed to be a method of data analysis before the result section. Was the data analysed using ANOVA, Chi-square, T-test? 4. There are serious grammatical errors in the manuscript. Please, make compulsory grammatical corrections in the entire manuscript. 5. Arrange the manuscript according to specifications outlined by the journal. 6. All binomial scientific names in the entire manuscript must be separated. Many of them have been joined in the manuscript. 7. Subject Table 1 to T-test analysis to determine significant difference between treatments. | <p>The notes were corrected as the reviewer requested.</p> <p>7. The fungal incidence data in Table 1 reflect the average incidence of fungi from the treatments of the experiment. Therefore, they present wide variability, so that using a means test, such as T-test, would assume a Type II error (when we do not reject the null hypothesis, and the null hypothesis is false) typical of parametric statistics with a high coefficient of variation. Therefore, we use descriptive analysis. This is widely used for important biological phenomena, but of great variability. However, we understood the correctness and excluded table 1 of the paper, and left only the descriptive analysis of the fungal incidence in the text. In addition, we have inserted the explanation mentioned earlier in the text so as to clarify the reader about the non-use of parametric statistics</p> |
| Minor REVISION comments | Good work by authors but the manuscript needs detailed grammatical corrections to enhance understanding of the details in the manuscript. | The notes were corrected as the reviewer requested. |
| Optional/General comments | The manuscript needs detailed grammatical corrections. I suggest that the authors make payment for a compulsory in house grammatical correction of the entire manuscript. | <p>The notes were corrected as the reviewer requested.</p> <p>There was a grammatical correction of the entire manuscript by specialized company.</p> <p>We appreciate the contributions.</p> |

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> | |