



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	The theme approached in the article is interesting. The use of organic fertilizers is currently necessary by the clamor of the planet and the grassland management for production optimization is always important. But there is in this article a shortage of content on the topic. Insufficient measures of the variables in all tables and the references are old. Among the 23 references are only 5 of the last 5 years. The results are expected and proven in many studies. Therefore, more information is needed about the chicken manure to better discuss the data. Lack the problems of the work, why the use of chicken manure and the increasing height of cut. This work has poor numbers of repetitions. It is recommended to experiment in the field, minimum of four replicates per treatment, to have greater freedom in the statistical analysis.	We put into effect some of your observations. Additional information has been included, for the exploration of the subject matter. All the measured variables were statistically analysed, using the treatments mean for evaluation. 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. Concerning the poor number of repetition as pointed, the three replications used in the field experiment falls within the minimum number of replication in RCBD design. Though four is better than three, five better than four, arguably, the statistical advantage gained is successively smaller with each added replicate. Moreover the design was a 3³ factorial design. However this claim does not in any way meant to dispute the factual observation made on the "poor numbers of repetition". Thanks for your comprehensive review of the manuscript.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		