



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_48700
Title of the Manuscript:	Use of Brachiarias in the improvement of physical and chemical attributes of a Yellow Oxisol
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	TITLE Change to Utilization of Brachiaria in the improvement of physical and chemical properties of Yellow Oxisol several long sentences were present in the manuscript from abstract to conclusion. Plz shorten them or break it up. Soil chemical analyses were not thoroughly discussed? Plz discuss in detail.	All corrections suggested by reviewers were made.
Minor REVISION comments	ABSTRACT Increase the volume of your abstract with more key findings from your research. it was mainly methodology. This study aimed to evaluate the effectCHANGE TO...the study evaluated the effect INTRODUCTION as noted by [3;4]change toas noted by Borges et al. and Gazolla et al. [3-4] of 80%separate numbers from units of measurements it is necessary to adopt practices that enable to maximize the forage production ...recast sentence In this context, [10]plz mention authors name as shown in e.g above Materials and method Five species of the genus Brachiaria were chosen, including.....Plz what or how did you identify the different species.... you must include it. described by [14], adapted by [15]plz correct of 24 hours,change to 24 hrs or 24 h. 50 ml of waterchange to 50 mL PH in water in ...wrong.....change to pH Comparedlower case RESULTS and DISCUSSIONS Significant and superiorfootnotes are of smaller fonts H + in thehydrogen ion or H ⁺ [18] affirm thatplz correct. see above ph values mayplz correct. see above aluminium andaluminum is American spelling This fact can be explained by the lowlong sentence.... break up if it did not Interfering significantlydid not interfere significantly the root system fasciculatedrephrase Significant and superiorfootnotes are of smaller font size According to [23], theplz correct. those observed by [24]plz correct. when compared the average soil"to" is missing CONCLUSIONS Conclusions are never written as bullet points etc. it is a running continuous sentence based on key findings from your work tied back to the objectives. so correct yours. references were very good. however why were some journal titles bolded? also some were written in upper letters while others were not. plz be specific. e.g Brazilian Journal of Soil Science & Journal of inorganic biochemistry & WORKSHOP ON FORESTRY SEEDS?	All corrections suggested by reviewers were made.
Optional/General comments		All corrections suggested by reviewers were made.

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>	

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>