



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>The heading is incomprehensible and needs to be changed. The initiating "As" and the final question mark do not match</p> <p>The references are almost exclusively in Portuguese – only 3 of 82 in English. A review article in English should be of interest to an English reading audience that should be able to follow up most of the references. The FAO overview from 2015 Status of the world's soil resources http://www.fao.org/3/a-i5199e.pdf gives a good overview including other soil threats than compaction and regional assessments including Latin America.</p> <p>The English language shows clear traces of a Portuguese influence, for instance with the soil referred to as "him" (line21), the retained water remaining under high "voltages" (tensions??) (line 40), "removal" (recuperar??) of information (line 46), "areas compacted" (áreas compactadas??) instead of compacted areas ((line 49) . The acronym RMP follows Portuguese and does not seem to be used in its English equivalent MRP. Sometimes it is very difficult to understand what is meant even though it seems likely that the Portuguese precedent may have been very logical. Language should be re-checked.</p> <p>Web links should be checked. Most of the weblinks could not be opened. Weblinks including doi's should further be given for all references for which they are available</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.
Minor REVISION comments	There are strange author attributions in references 35, 54,	
Optional/General comments	This is a good and thorough review of mechanical resistance of soils that deserves publication if the presentation can be significantly improved	

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>	Does not exist.