



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_46589
Title of the Manuscript:	AS THE SOIL RESISTANCE TO PENETRATION AFFECTS THE DEVELOPMENT OF AGRICULTURAL CROPS?
Type of the Article	Review Paper

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	<p>Abstract Don't use mechanical resistance to penetration. Use soil penetration resistance (SPR). The compression process has not been defined previously. Replace term. Soil density is wrong. Use bulk density. In the conclusions of the abstract, it is stated that knowledge of critical SPR limits to agricultural crops is necessary. However, few results were found in the literature.</p> <p>Keywords Soil density = bulk density. What is sustainability? Very broad term. Change.</p> <p>Introduction Line 20: Explain how soil moisture affects SPR.</p> <p>Literature review Line 74: water content in the soil = soil moisture. Line 89: soil density = bulk density. Line 111: soil density = bulk density. Line 139: A little explanatory topic and I didn't contribute scientifically to the review because it brings technical information. Topic should be improved by adding other models of SPR adjustment using bulk density and soil moisture, such as Busscher (1990). Line 190: soil moisture = soil moisture. Line 194 to 209: Headings of the axes of fig. 1 completely wrong and in disagreement with the terms used in the text presented. Line 230: density = bulk density. Line 240 to 244: Where did these values come from? Substantiate and discuss them with references. Line 265 and 266: condition of compression: SPR is only compaction indicator. Line 270: majority of plants. Which plants? Line 271: consolidated = compacted. Line 278: compression. Adequate term. And what were the SPR values? Line 285: showed higher. What are the SPR and bulk density values? For what soil texture? Line 285 and 286: soil density = bulk density. Line 292 to 297: Paragraph without reference. Who said that? Line 305: What increase? Mention values, how much has it increased? Line 402: soil density = bulk density.</p> <p>Conclusions Little was discussed about the critical limits of SPR found in the literature. Review should be improved in this regard.</p>	<p>The changes were performed in the work as suggested by the evaluator, and some points were improved in order to have a better structured manuscript.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Title: The review was based on scientific studies carried out in the majority of Brazil, as could be observed through bibliographical references. Therefore, I suggest that the title be mentioned in the title of the country to which the readers are addressed, as this will certainly not apply to situations in soils of temperate regions.</p> <p>The term sustainable agriculture has been used in the text several times, referring only to the attribute of soil penetration resistance. Sustainable agriculture encompasses many complex physical, chemical, and biological factors that interact with each other and make the system sustainable. Only the compaction factor measured by soil penetration</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	resistance doesn't make a complex system of land use and management sustainable. Review the term "sustainability" and use the most appropriate term referring to the main attribute, object of the present revision.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The text has translation errors and should be reviewed by native English speakers.	

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>	Does not exist.