



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_48538
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Agronomic characteristics and chemical-bromatological composition of piatã grass submitted to nitrogen doses and cutting heights</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>1. Recent literature pertaining to the present study is lacking behind 2014. Addition of recent references (2014-2019) in the Introduction and Discussion is to be made compulsory.</p> <p>2. More details on how these were performed in the present study is required to be added (refer following)</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The determination of the dry matter content of the leaf blade, pseudocolus and senescent material components of the samples was performed according to the authors cited in the reference [13].</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The crude protein (CP), neutral detergent fiber (NDF), acid detergent fiber (FAD) and mineral matter (MM) were determined according to the methodology of the authors cited in the reference [13].</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The data were submitted to analysis of variance and regression, using the SANEST software [14].</p> <p>3. Is this the plant name: 'brachiariadecumbens'. Make it in scientific manner throughout the text.</p> <p>4. Why g/pot is equated with kg/ha? In this case, how to compare the parameters with reference to the study?</p> <p>5. What could be the conclusion, if the increase is too meager: "In the second cut, there was an increase of 0.0058% in the CP content of pseudocolus per kg of N applied (Table 2)".</p> <p>6. "Contrasting results were reported by the authors cited in the references [25],...". Only one reference was cited!</p> <p>7. These are to be modified: ". The authors cited in the references [26]".....</p> <p>8. Define clearly the 'first cut and second cut' – harvest by means of cutting? It is not attractive to the readers.</p> <p>9. Conclusion is not indicating what the study insists and the further scope of the study. These details are to be added to this section along with more pronounced results of the present study.</p> <p>10. Finally, I recommend the article to be accepted after major revisions in line with the above comments.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>N. Karmegam</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Government Arts College, India</i></b>