



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_48406
Title of the Manuscript:	Nitrogen fertilization of Marandu palisade grass under different periods of deferment
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>Good study fit for publication by JEAI.</p> <p>However, some corrections and additions need to be integrated before the paper is considered for publication.</p> <p>First and foremost, the methodology and results sections should be sub-divided into sub-sections in order to ease comprehension. For example, the methodology section should be sub-divided into location of study area, data collection procedure, as well as data analysis procedure. The results section on its part should be sub-divided into sub-sections following the specific objectives of the study. All these will ease comprehension.</p> <p>Moreover, the findings of the study should be discussed in-depth. This should be done in a comparative fashion i.e. comparing and contrasting the findings of the present study with the findings of other authors who have conducted related research. And the most recent research works that fall in line with the subject matter of the study should be used to discuss the findings. This will give the paper more scientific robustness.</p> <p>A proper conclusion should be given. And it is worth noting that a conclusion is not numbered. It should be general and should reflect the findings of the paper.</p>	<p>The authors agree and are grateful for the observations made by the reviewer.</p> <p>We have done our best to correct the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Methodological subsections; - Sub-sections of presentation of results; - Conclusion not numbered; - Adequacy of the discussion; <p>Corrections were highlighted (yellow) throughout the text.</p>
	The most recent research works (2014 – 2019) that fall in line with the paper should be consulted and cited in the paper. Papers dating to as far back as the 1980s, 90s, and early 2000s should be cited sparingly. Citing the most recent papers will give the work more relevance in today's context.	Proposal accepted. The works used were reviewed.
Optional/General comments	Good paper that could be considered for publication. However, the aforementioned comments and evaluations should be taken into consideration before the paper is considered for publication.	Proposal accepted.

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>	Do not exist.