



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
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>)

**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>The manuscript in its form looks like a review which is still doubtful. The author suppose to rewrite it in research form! With materials and methods, results and discussion etc. Literature review should be expunged from the text. It needs major revision. Where did the author get all the figures and the tables, copied from some authors or are they results of his experiment? There are many uncoordinated sentences and many grammatical errors in the text</b>	The structure of the review was elaborated according to the guidelines of the journal, which shows that for literature review, it is necessary to introduce, develop and conclude, not being the same structure of a scientific article. For this reason, the authors believe that this model in which it was constructed is more appropriate.  Corrections were made at the suggestion of the evaluator, being important to improve the writing and structuring of the work.
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	References are not well cited. The names of the authors were not written, et al was written in places where names should be. The author should rewrite the manuscript and then send back to reviewer for further reviewing.	Corrections were made at the suggestion of the evaluator, being important to improve the writing and structuring of the work.

**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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	Don't not exist.