



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_47155
Title of the Manuscript:	PHYSICAL AND CONSERVATIONAL DIAGNOSIS OF THE HYDROGRAPHIC MICROBACY OF RIO FARINHA
Type of the Article	Original research 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	<p><b>TOPIC:</b> The word "Microbacy" need be replaced with "Micro-Basin" in the</p> <p><b>ABSTRACT:</b> The open sentence is written in an unknown language which is not acceptable. : There are many instances of poor language structures, inappropriate used of punctuation marks, commas etc. (see the reviewed manuscript for details).</p> <p><b>METHODOLOGY:</b> The statistical methods used were not mention in the methodology of this work.</p> <p><b>DISCUSSION:</b> The central concepts Physical and conservational diagnoses are not adequately integrated in the discourse of this manuscript.</p>	<p>The word microbasin was replaced by Micro-basin. In the summary, I corrected the first two sentences, because it occurred a mistake to leave the author in Portuguese. The points and commas were checked. In the methodology, there is no statistical method, it should be a work that does not need to be used, because maps and tables that use only percentage are generated.</p> <p>In relation to the discussion, some paragraphs were added in the course of the text. Many thanks for the suggestions !!</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	This is a good manuscript with well communicated results. However, the abstract requires thorough review and corrections.	

**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)	Does not exist