



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_20597
Title of the Manuscript:	Density and Cultivar Effects on the Biomass and Crop Growth Rate of Upland Rice in Uyo Southeastern Nigeria
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	Scrutinize the text for typing errors like <row 25 - 0.246g/hill → 0.246 g/hill> <row 44 - 5kg → 5 kg> and <row 50 – 7.5tha⁻¹ → 7.5 tha⁻¹> <row 83 - 32°C → 32 °C > etc, too many of them to correct for reviewer case by case! Title: O.K. Abstract: O.K. Keywords: O.K. Introduction: O.K. Materials and Methods: O.K. Results: few corrections need, row 68 – high hill densitiy – <i>Density of hills per ha or density of plants per ha?</i> Tables - Population Densityha-1 ? → Density plant/ha ? Discussion: few corrections Conclusions: O.K. References: O.K.	The text has been scrutinized for typing errors and corrected. Corrected to high plant density per hectare. Corrected to density plant/ha.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	row 48 – of 1.8 tha⁻¹, [5] is → of 1.8 tha⁻¹ [5], is row 58 – [6] observed → Takai et al. [6] observed row 66 - According to [7], → According to San-oh et al. [7], row 143 – (g/hill) → ghill⁻¹ row 281 - was reported by [13]. → was reported by Lack et al. [13]. row 283 - [6] attributed high biomass production at the tillering stage to vigorous tiller increase and improvement in canopy photosynthesis. → Takai et al. attributed high biomass production at the tillering stage to vigorous tiller increase and improvement in canopy photosynthesis [6]. row 288 - [13] reported → Lack et al. [13] reported row 293 - that [9] reported → that Slus [9] reported	Corrected to: of 1.8 tha⁻¹ All the corrections have been made in accordance with the comments. Corrections effected.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	row 296 - According to [14], dry → According to Aruna et. al [14], dry row 300 – report of [15] → report of Ntanos et al. [15] row 303 – cultivar. [7] → cultivar. San-oh et al [7] row 317 - According to [16], crop → According to Fageria [16], crop row 324 - cultivars. [6] reported → cultivars. Takai et al. [6] reported row 332 - report of [7] that → report of San-oh et al. [7] that	I previously thought that two co-authors, e.g., ArunaGeetha and Thiyarajan; Ntanos and Koutroubbas could be cited as such in the text while co-authors from three and above could be cited in text with the lead author followed by et al. I really appreciate the comments because they help improve the quality of the manuscript report. Thank you.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	After correction of mistakes the manuscript might be accepted for publication.	