



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The Abstract is incomplete and you should write it according to the standards of the journal (items: aims, study design, place and duration of the study, the methodology, results and conclusion). It does not indicate place and duration of the experiment and you should clarify the used methodology (Materials and Methods). I suggest modify Key words. They appear as key words variables measured in this experiment. Example Key words: <i>Panicum maximum</i>, <i>poultry manure</i>, <i>cutting height</i>, <i>growth</i>, <i>Nigeria</i>. Introduction. OK. I suggest adding some information already published on the application of poultry manure in <i>Panicum maximum</i>. See EFFECT OF POULTRY MANURE ON SOIL PHYSIO-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES, AGGREGATE STABILITY AND BIOMASS YIELD OF <i>Panicum maximum</i> (<i>International Journal of Current Research Vol. 4, Issue, 04, pp.013-016, April, 2012</i>). Methodology: OK. It should add information on the time of year that took place and when the experiment ended.	The place and duration of the experiment has been included in the abstract. Nevertheless, we think the abstract was constructed according to the standards of the journal. Moreover, clarification of the used methodology was presented under "methodology". In the aspect of modifying the key words, we (authors) agreed to take a leaf out of your suggestion. It is neither more nor less the way you suggested it. Thanks for the suggested journal. We read it and found some information vital for upgrading our work. However, other useful information's were added to the "introduction". The missing piece in the "methodology" has been included.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Results: OK. It should indicate the degree days accumulated at each court date (°Cd) to extrapolate to other conditions. Discussion and Conclusion: OK.	We have included the dates of harvest. Harvesting interval (35 days) was maintained throughout the harvest periods after the first general harvest.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 43. Add italic <i>Panicum maximum</i>. Line 56. Add space 15cm Bibliography. Some names of journals are abbreviated and others are not. You should unify criteria (e.g. compare reference 16 and 18).	The observed errors have been corrected.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This paper reports interesting observations about the effect of cutting height, poultry manure and the best combination of the two on the growth of <i>Panicum maximum</i> grown in Nsukka, Nigeria.	Thanks for the comprehensive review of the manuscript.