



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_48615
Title of the Manuscript:	DRY MATTER YIELD AND BROMATOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF ELEPHANT-GRASS
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	<p>This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. The Topic, Abstract, Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results and Discussion, 3 Tables, Conclusion and References are all of acceptable standard. However, some corrections could be effected to upgrade and bring this article to the required standard of this Journal.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sub headings need to be numbered where required, eg. 1. INTRODUCTION in Line 27; 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS in Line 53; 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION in Line 110; etc. could see this Journal Sample article. 2. There is need for this manuscript to be re-written to the standard acceptable for this Journal. 3. Within the text of the whole write up, square numbered boxes [] ought to be used for the references. 4. At the back of this manuscript, References are not numbered as they appeared in the body of the text. Lines 183 – 251. Journal names should not be in bold. 5. The word state need to start with capital 's' as State; could see Lines 15, 51, 63, 68, 118, 179 	<p>All suggested changes were made. The titles and subheadings numbered. The references cited in the text and at the end of the manuscript were changed according to the norms of the journal. The word state has been corrected throughout the text for "State"</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In Line 3: Topic could be put as – DRY MATTER YIELD AND NUTRITIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF ELEPHANT-GRASS GENOTYPES 2. Lines 15 -16: Could be put as - It was applied the randomized complete block experimental design with 53 accessions two replications. 3. Lines 20 – 21: Could be put as – The Mineiro, Guaçu IZ-2 and Acesso 91 – EMBRAPA genotypes were superior in 4. Line 24: Could put Keywords as – <i>Keywords: Pennisetum purpureum Schum., yield characteristics, nutrients, forage genetic resources.</i> 5. Lines 53 – 54; between Lines 60 and 61; between Lines 69 and 70 and between Lines 94 and 95; Lines 110 and 111; Between Lines 125 and 126 and Line 173: Could include some more sub headings in the work as – 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS 2.1 Experimental Location and Soil Classification 2.2 Identification of the Elephant-grass Accessions 2.3 Experimental Design and Data Collection 2.4 Data Analysis <p>3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</p>	<p>All suggestions were adhered to and marked in the attached document - 'article with marked corrections'</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>3.1 Analysis of Variance 3.2 Means Referring to DMY, CP and NDF Characteristics 4. CONCLUSION</p> <p>6. Lines 70 and 71: Could be corrected as – The randomized complete block experimental design with 53 accessions and two replications was applied. ; soil by ploughing, 7. Line 97: Could be – during rainy period 8. Within Line 118: DMY t ha⁻¹ 9. Line 119: Could include in the foot notes – <i>FV, Sources of variation</i> 10. In Line 142: Could delete 'in %' from the foot notes 11. Lines 145 to 148 and 149: Could be put as follows - Costa Rica; Guaçu/IZ.2; Gramafante; Mercker Comum; Mercker Comum Pinda; Mineiro; Mole de Volta Grande; Porto Rico; Taiwan A - 144. In Line 149 could start as – In a similar research, when assessing 12. In Line 164: Could include 'and lower quality' as follows - therefore they were higher and lower quality than the ones found in 13. In the list of genotypes in Lines 166 to 169 could delete ' Gado de Leite' and 'Roxo' – (not found or below %) 14. Line 176: Could be corrected as - The Mineiro, Guaçu IZ-2 and Acesso 91 – EMBRAPA genotypes were</p>	
Optional/General comments	Author(s) could put in more effort to upgrade this article and simple work.	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>