



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_23608
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of NPK Treatments on Sweet Sorghum Yields for Biofuel Feedstock in Piedmont Region of North Carolina
Type of the Article	Original Research Articles

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	Title: Include in bracket the botanical name after the words Sweet Sorghum. Key Words: Arrange the key words alphabetically, starting from biofuel and ending with Sweet sorghum. Abstract: include the abstract of the paper. The word <u>U.S.</u> should be written in full or use USA. The figure 6.624e8 liters in line15 and others, what does the stand for? Can you covert them to conventional and standard format, please. Materials and methods: show clearly the methods/instruments used for data collection and the interval. Indicate the plant population (160,000 stands per Ha). Lines 175-177: Change the word 'cane' to 'stalk' and do the same in all especially in Tables 2 and 3. Line 185: The words "Fisher Scientific", how does it apply here? Results and Discussion: Line 196: <u>Not a significant</u> should be change to <u>no significant</u>. Table 2: Title should read, "Fresh Biomass Yield". Remove ... top (including cane, leaves and panicles). Tables 2-7: The empty space should be titles "Fertilizer treatment", the treatment 0-0-0, should read control. The titles in tables 2-7, <u>α</u>= 0.05 is not clear. In line 160, section 2.5: Experimental design and Statistical analysis,	Thank you for your time and your suggestions. We have included your suggestions and modified the manuscript. I hope we have addressed all the items in your review. Thank you Liters were taken out of the text to keep it simple.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	it was stated as $P \leq 0.05$. Line 204: cane top fresh weight; should read, Fresh biomass yield. Table 3: Title should read, Stalk fresh weight (ton/ha or tonha⁻¹). Table 3 and 4: The ton/ha and liters/ha respectively, should be in bracket. Table 5: Total sugar level in%, should read, "Per cent Sugar level" Table 6: BRIX reading of juice at harvest in %, should either read, Per cent BRIX reading of juice at harvest or BRIX reading of juice at harvest (%). Line 269: There was not an effect should read "There was no significant effect" Lines 274: Give reference(s) for a scientific comparison. Table 7: How can you account for these increase in sugar yield (L/ha) with just a few stands of the sorghum plants/ha? Your results were not discussed. Authors merely stopped at result presentation and scanty interpretation No conclusive recommendation(s). References: there were altogether 30 references, as referenced in the text but 29 references were presented in reference section. For instance;	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	In line 92, reference No. 28 was presented as No. 27 in reference section. In lines 152 and 188, reference Nos. 29 and 30 were presented as No. 28 and 29 respectively, in reference section. These show grossly inconsistency.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Present your data according to the number of intervals in which data were collected.	The data collected at such intervals is used towards building a model, so we can not present the data in this manuscript.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Abstract should be clearly and properly stated in this paper.	