



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2015_AJEA_16424
Title of the Manuscript:	Growth Response of Guinea Grass (<i>Panicum maximum</i>) to Cutting Height and Poultry Manure
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 (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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Manuscript concerns an interesting and important problem - growth response of Guinea grass (<i>Panicum maximum</i>) to cutting height and poultry manure. Investigated are the effect of cutting height and poultry manure on the growth of <i>Panicum maximum</i>. Abstract is clear, brief and representative of the work and underlines the significance of the subject. Introduction is understandable, clear and comprehensive exposing the reader to the topic. Purpose and objectives are scientifically appropriate. The methodology used is accurate and correctly described. So described it allow experiment to be reproduced. Appropriate statistics was used. The experimental results are thoroughly and logically interpreted in the discussion and presented with clarity. Author (-s) compared the results obtained with the experiments and results of previous studies on the relevant subject. The findings are particularly valuable having in a mind importance of the crop studied.	Really appreciate your commendation.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	However, some very minor errors were noted: In "Introduction" are used only eight authors. I think that this is insufficiently. In "Literature cited" line 182. 2. Motta MS ... 1953; 21:33-41.- missing in the	The "Introduction" has been improved with some useful information and additional citations. The missing citation in the text has been rectified. It will be found in the introduction.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	text . The reviewer have one suggestions for improving this manuscript In “Results ” Line 82 – There is repetition with Lines 84-85 in Table 1 the title can be modifying. Tables from 2 to 7 contain similar titles for first row and first column which can be suitable modified. In “Literature cited” are given comparative old literary sources - Lines 242; 245 and 249. Author (-s) can comment other recent studies.	The title of each table has been modified to ameliorate the issue of repetition. Based on the comparative old literary sources cited in this work, the author found the need to highlight some (its) useful information to extrapolate the findings. Moreover concerted efforts were made to construe some useful information from recent studies to expatiate the subject matter.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Organization into sections and subsections was well done and paper structure is clear and arranged according to journal style.	Thanks.