



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_33245
Title of the Manuscript:	Differential Response of Four Sugarcane (<i>Saccharum officinarum</i> L.) varieties to NPK 20:10:10 Fertilizer in South western Nigeria
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	Line 2-3: edit "Differential response of four sugarcane (<i>Saccharum officinarum</i> L.) varieties to NPK 20:10:10 fertilizer in South-western Nigeria" Line 5-6: ... 2001, respectively ... Line 12: $p < 0.05$ Line 14-15: rewrite "Cane weight during the wet season ranged from 0.48 to 1.35 kg" per what??? Line 17: change .."ranged from 4.11 t/ha to 9.74 t/ha with .." Line 20: glucose, Line 21: glucose Line 23: use either "$p < 0.05$" or "95% confidence interval" Line 25-26: rewrite "In conclusion, the application of NPK fertilizer increased sugar concentration and sugar-cane yield for NCS005 and Co6215 compared to NCS003 and NCS004 varieties. Revise you key words Line 33: leave space ".. 1987). The ..." Line 39: delete "And" Line 42: write NPK in full. Line 41-45 "lieu of this, a study was carried out to determine the effect of NPK (20:10:10) fertilizer on the weight of cane, yield and dry matter components of different sugarcane varieties (<i>Saccharum officinarum</i> L), in order to identify the variety that can be greatly influenced by the NPK fertilizer to increase sugarcane tonnage in the country." Should be moved to the end of "Introduction". The sentence is also too long. Cut it into two sentences or rephrase to shorten it. Line 48: space "... (Ca), which" Line 50-51: rewrite "It has been proved by Barnes (1954) that phosphorus, potassium and especially nitrogen were used at a higher rate by the plant than the soil could generate." Line 56: delete "Also" Line 57 should be "kg ha^{-1}" Line 62: delete "Sugar is a very important dry matter of Sugarcane." Line 55: rewrite "Researchers such as Humbert (1968) reported that nitrogen fertilizer use increased the	Line 2-3 has been edited, corrected to small letter Line 5-6, the comma is inserted after 2001 Line 12, $P < 5$ is inserted Line 14-15, cane weight per plot, is inserted Line 20 and 21 G has been change to g and % added as prefix Line 25-26 ,it has been corrected It has been effected It has been moved to line 65 - 70 Line 45-46, it been corrected Line 52 corrected It has been deleted line 57 Line 50 and 53 has been rewritten as suggested



SDI Review Form 1.6

	attainable tonnage of sugar." Line 56: rewrite "According to Lakshmi et al. (2003), application.." Line 62: Is this sentence necessary "Sugar is a very important dry matter of Sugarcane." if not delete Line 63: sugarcane include: total sugar, sucrose, reducing sugar (i.e. glucose and fructose) and crude fibre.. Line 76: write correct latitude and longitude. Check in literature how this is done correctly Line 78: What do the PRE- PLANTING SOIL ANALYTICAL RESULTS mean in relation to cultivation of sugar can? Where the analyzed soil nutrients adequate for the crop? Explain in a sub-section/or paragraph Line 81-82: rewrite "The experiment was laid out using in a Randomized Complete Block Design (RCBD) design with three replicates." Line 83: 8 meters by 11 meters Line 89: 112 kg NPK/ha Line 93: delete "to" Line 94: p<0.05 Line 100: Fig 1 and Fig 2. Line 129-130: Is it Table 3 or table 3. Use Table 3 and be consistent throughout the document 134: replace "xx" with either "****" or "***" or "**" Line 135: delete "NCS = National Cereal Sugarcane hybrid," Line 139: ... Table 4, Fig 4 and Fig 5, respectively. Line 141: rewrite "The values of cane weight ranged from 0.70 to 1.75 kg/plot." Line 142-143: 4). The same result were recorded for sugar-cane yield and it ranged from 3.95 ton/ha to 10.1 t/ha. Line 145: yield due to NPK fertilizer application. Line 150: rewrite "3.70 for variety NCS003 to 7.15 for variety Co62175" or "The value of % sucrose for Co62175 and NCS003 were 7.15 and 3.70, respectively." Line 167: replace "xx" with either "****" or "***" or "**" Line 167: delete "NCS = National Cereal Sugarcane hybrid," Line 167: use: Note " *** = very highly significant", "*** = highly significant", "** = significant" Line 170: 112 kg NPK ha⁻¹ fertilizer Line 171: weight Line 173: ... NCS005 had higher sugar concentration and yield respectively, in response ... Line 176: replace "can be" with "were" Tables and Figure do not have titles. Please name	Line 62 sugar is a very important--- has been deleted Line 63, the capital letter at the beginning of sucrose, total sugar , reducing sugar etc has been changed to small letter Line 76 corrected Line 81-82,83,89 rewrite Delete to line 93 Inserted < 0.05 Line 94 Table 3 is consistent line 129-130 Replace "xx" with"***" line 134 Delete NCS line 135 It has been effected It has been effected
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	them Some references are too old (1940-1983) for this study. Replace/use current information. Be consistent either use kg ha⁻¹ or kg/ha Be consistent either use ton ha⁻¹ or ton/ha Is it "South-west Nigeria" or "South-western Nigeria" Which will you adopt "Fig" or "Figure", "Table" or "table" Is it "NCS003/004/005" or "NCS 003/ 004 /005"? Be careful in Capitalizing Each Word. Check the attached pdf file What software did you use to analyse the data? Suggestions to include under: 2 Materials and methods 2.1 Description of the study site 2.2 Weather data 2.3 Soil analysis 2.4 Data analysis 3 Results and discussion Add a bit more discussion. How do other researchers agree or disagree with your findings?	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		