



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_26907
Title of the Manuscript:	Growth Response to Nutrient Management during a 3 Year Study of Miscanthus x Giganteus
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	2.2. The experimental plot layout was a 2x5 (why 2x5 when you had 3 harvest and 5 nutrients management?) factorial design (is it RCBD, CRD, Split plot etc. Specify which) replicated four times. A total of twenty (the total plots should be 3harvest x 5nutrient management x4replications = 45plots) 4m x 12m plots were established with 3m alley. Furthermore, the 3 harvest period procedures are not clearly stated. There is need for the author to clearly describe the harvest procedures with respect to each level of harvest. 2.4 Growth response was analyzed using PROC MIXED (SAS v9.2, SAS Institute, Cary, NC, U.S.A.), using (4) replications with (5) fertilizer rates "Nutrient Management", and (3) harvest years "Harvest Year" as fixed effects (replication should be a random effect for a proper model as we normally don't have control over the block effect and we are extrapolating the results mostly on per hectare basis. While harvest will be more of random effect than fixed effect base on objective two: putting year into consideration) with the corresponding interaction between "Nutrient Management" x "Harvest Years" (this interaction should also be considered as random effect).	The 2x5 is for the entire study, we are collecting data from miscanthus in 2 different harvesting programs, First one is an end of the growing season harvest and second one has mid-season and end of the season harvests. We are reporting here the data collected from the First harvest program. So, in each harvest program we have 5 treatments replicated 4 times, hence 20 plots. Thank you for your suggestions. Duly noted and modified.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 137- 141. Recast to something like “significant differences were found in comparisons between T1 with T3, T4 and T5”. Also in 2014, comparison of T1 with T2 was also significant so the trend is not similar. 4. Discussion: The author should explain why more increase in dry matter accumulation from 2014 to 2015 than from 2013 to 2014.	Miscanthus rhizomes get established in the soil and biomass production each year increases reaching a plateau around year 6 to 7.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	A concluding statement should be included in the abstract. The nutrient rates should be stated in the methodology. The results section should be recast to properly interprets the tables. Why is the means of harvest not presented?	Thank you for the suggestions. Statements are included in the revised version.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Will it be possible to determine an optimum treatment level for both main effects where dry matter accumulation will be maximum other than the rates specified (something like regression analysis).	T3 is the optimum fertilizer treatment in this study.