



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 	
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>	



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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

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>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Grace O. Tona
Department, University & Country	Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, Nigeria