



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The introduction seems not to be inter related. The authors' were just writing without relating their points. Similar issue was noted in materials and methods. The materials and methods needs to be re written to follow sequentially and some materials in results should be brought back to materials and methods. I have attached main work where I made observations. You do not start referring to methods in results. The material and methods ends with the purpose of the work defined but it is not so in this work. The authours seems to be overwhelmed by their data that they seems to be teaching or reciting literature instead of presenting the work in a way it can be understood and redone by another interest party. Re write the materials and methods please.	The introduction has been corrected so that a greater connection between the paragraphs occurs. In relation to materials and methods, some parts were added and changes occurred in the order of topics for a better understanding. At the beginning of the results and discussions, the two paragraphs were corrected. And in the course of the text were added some paragraphs of discussions of the data. In the conclusion the paragraph was corrected that the evaluation suggested
Minor REVISION comments	The work should be re written with reference to corrections made. It is not a bad work but the presentation is the problem. Let areas be specified and do not jump from one issue to the other and make the tables looking good. Check spellings and use of English. The grammar is very poor	The spelling and grammar of the text were checked Thank you for the suggested suggestions. I'm open for new suggestions!
Optional/General comments		

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