



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_47111
Title of the Manuscript:	Resistance of Soybean to Fungal Diseases Using Copper-based Protectors
Type of the Article	Original research papers

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lines 9 and 10: the phrase “for the control of diseases” is followed by names of organisms and not names of diseases Suggestions: “for the control of diseases caused by” or author retains the phrase as it is but list the diseases in place of those pathogens. • Line 12: treatments, which included protectors associated with fungicides Azimut[®], Orkestra[®], Ativum[®] and Horos[®] + adjuvant Assist[®], were applied.. • Line 16: was effective. • Abbreviations: like LICOR, CFD and NHT were not predefined (abbreviations should be expressed in full or defined before subsequent utilization in the text). • Line 17: Same observation as in Lines 9 and 10 above. • The Abstract section is very important, most readers come in contact with the abstract first and such encounter may determine whether they go further with the paper or not. The details of application was not clear enough, author stipulated two different disjoint sets of application (clarity of purpose might be needed). Also, the most significant figures, percentages and/or correlation relating to severity and yield could be stated in the Abstract section. Also, some keywords were listed that do not reflect in the abstract. • Line 29:several diseases that affect the cultivation of this crop and make it difficult... • Line 77: Organic matter • Line 86: Description of the treatments (protectors and doses) applied in the soybean crop. • Line 102: Same observation as in Lines 9 and 10 above, the grammatical expression also requires adjustment. • Lines 186-187: ...the middle third was also observed to be sensitive... • Line 256: the sentence started with “Also mentions that....” This is not understandable. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lines 72-77: Soil analysis result could have been presented as a table with average determinations and possibly with standard error of mean. • Line 205: The expression is ambiguous. • Specific disease names should replace several instances (in the Results and Discussion) where the organism names were mentioned (refer observations as in Lines 9 and 10 above). • I suppose Lines 276 and 277 reflect a sentence continuation instead of a paragraph (although that would make the sentence an unusually long one); if not, then the paragraph starting from Line 277 contains an incomplete sentence. • References with incomplete citation (like work title, volume, page, publisher e.t.c) should be adjusted 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The research idea is academically interesting; it established a very good comparative balance between the inclusion of (best) cu-protectors against selected pathogens and the impact of dose on soybean harvest yield. • Overall grammatical composition should be carefully attended to in terms of punctuations and sentence readjustments where necessary. • Results detailing the effect of applications on the manifestation of each disease under study were not extensively detailed. More tables showing these could have been more informative. 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

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>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Oluwafemi Michael ADEDIRE</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Federal College of Agriculture, Nigeria</i>