



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_9028
Title of the Manuscript:	Maize response to competition from speargrass (<i>Imperata cylindrica</i> (L.) Raeuschel) regrowth from planted rhizomes I: Species Growth relationship, Yield and Yield components
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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The MS is of interest for scientists and farmers. But I miss sound methodology concerning data collection and statistical analysis. In fact, it is done well to suppress the other weed species from the field to have only the effect of <i>I. Cylindrical</i>. However, this operation was done after 2 weeks and this period was enough for them to impact maize growing especially during the first month of cropping. Therefore, author should record (e.g. weigh, density...) the suppressed weed. This data should be used also as random factor in the mixed model analysis. Actually, the results presented are including not only the effect of <i>I. Cylindrica</i>.	I think the methodology, data collection and statistical analysis is adequate for now. Hand pulling of other weeds were done weekly not after 2 weeks see text (line number 97). Beside the fact that the speargrass shoot regrowth from previous rhizomes were taller and growing vigorously than other volunteered weeds. Sometimes the other weeds were not there, and their effect were not near significant, as to have any effect on the dominant speargrass which is more efficient and a stronger competitor.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Missing space between words and such errors are frequent in the text body (see attached file).	Corrected
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	If not possible to introduce the data of other weed species in the field, authors should discuss this effect. However, the discussion presented is poor due to insufficient explanation of the competition with was only focussed on PAR meanwhile; nutrient requirement could be explore based on the literature. We were also expecting insight of moisture competition with sound report from literature.	This is a study that can go further to explore other expect of competitive relationships between speargrass and maize or other plants, like nutrient requirement and moisture competition as you mentioned. PAR for now yes. We look at practical situation of small holders farmers faced with the problem of speargrass regrowth sometimes occasioned by land preparation method.