



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_49627
Title of the Manuscript:	Complementary application of inoculant in post-emergence on soybean crop
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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	<p>1) Abstarct: Study design: A randomized complete block design (DBC) was used. Randomized complete block design should should use (RCBD) .</p> <p>2) Authors lack the important discussion corresponded to their results. Thus, authors should add their discussions in many issues, as follow:</p> <p>2.1 Why the complementary of liquid inoculant (<i>Bradyrhizobium japonicum</i>), via leaf, activated the leaf chlorophyll index?,</p> <p>2.2 Why the increased inoculant doses application affected to lower chlorophyll index?</p> <p>2.3 Why the increased inoculant doses application affected to lower leaf area?</p> <p>2.4 Why the increased inoculant doses application affected to higher nodules per plant?</p> <p>2.5 Why the complementary of liquid inoculant (<i>Bradyrhizobium japonicum</i>), via leaf, activated the nodulation?</p> <p>2.6 Why the complementary of liquid inoculant (<i>Bradyrhizobium japonicum</i>), via leaf, promoted the productive yield?</p> <p>2.7 Why dry mass of aerial parts showed the maximal values when treated with 225 mL ha⁻¹</p> <p>2.8 Fig 5: Why V4 showed the different responses from the others?</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1) Reference number 7. (<i>Phaseolus vulg.</i> L.) please check the accuracy.</p> <p>2) Reference number 8 <i>Bradyrhizobium japonicum</i> change to <i>Bradyrhizobium japonicum</i></p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>Authors should add their discussions to explain their results, not only wrote like these</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - . These results are corroborate those observed by Pereira et al. [8], - These results corroborate those obtained in Australia, 	



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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Benjawan Chutichudet</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Maharakham University, Thailand</i>