



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_40463
Title of the Manuscript:	Agroeconomic performance of the onion (<i>Allium fistulosum</i>) under different seedlings management methods
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	The statistical analysis must consider a 2x4x2 factorial treatment structure which will consider one 3-ways and three 2-ways interactions. The results of the economic analysis presented in table 5 needs to be completed with means separation procedure.	In this specific case, the components of variance were determined considering a complete factorial design, with two factors split in each plot (factor 1, with two levels – with or without cuts - and factor 2 with four levels – chives cultivated with 2, 3, 4 or 5 tillers), and a third factor (harvesting time) that was allocated in the subplots. This was necessary because we needed to compare each level of the “cutting” factor (with or without cuts) on their specific physiological harvesting times (the plots where the cut was made took longer to reach harvesting time). Therefore, each experimental unit was divided in two subplots to compare the harvesting times in plots with and without cuts. An experimental block illustration (three blocks in the experiment) Factorial design (2X4) 8 plots per block Observation: 24 plots (8 for each block). Two subplots per plot. Therefore, we had 48 subplots in this experiment.
Minor REVISION comments	The references are not listed in the order of citation, but in alphabetic order, why? In the Introduction section; the citation stated with [5] and in the first page, authors cited are [5], [6], [8], [18] then [17]. Line 27, In the tiller, we find etc. instead, it is better to replace we by author(s) [17]. Line 31, "Because of its great capacity for regrowth, replace several crops can be harvested by several harvests are possible. If possible, give some information on how harvesting time may influence the quality and the price of the harvested product. What is the best price, is it for fresh or dry Line 34, "many ~~family~~ farmers have given give preference to the commercialization, etc. Material and Methods section The number of the treatments is 16, so the treatment structure is 2x4x2 with three factors: cutting (with and without) (2 levels); number of tillers (4 levels); and harvesting time (2 levels). How do you explain a split-plot design with three factors? Lines 77 and 85, "the harvest was carried out in two seasons etc., I suggest using two times as it is in the tables of the results. Lines 81 and 82, why not to give the length in mm as it is for the diameter, or in cm as indicated in line 88? Lines 83-84 "The cultural treatments consisted of etc." I suggest replacing it by management practices or crop management. Explain what cover fertilizer is for this specific crop, as all the potential readers may not have access to the cited reference [8] Lines 93-104 Economic analysis: this section is not clear for readers out-side the country of the experiment. what are the price of the products, and the costs of inputs	The suggestions were met, except for the suggestion about the experimental design, which was justified above. In the item Results and Discussion the suggestion about the statistic has already been justified above; In Table 5 there is no level of significance since only the mean values were compared.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	used? What is the price of 100g “pack”? Statistical analysis: as mentioned above with the 16 treatments, the factorial combination is 2x4x2, so there are one three-ways interaction and three two-ways interactions, which one are significant and which ones are not significant is not clear? Results and Discussion Line 117, “The analysis of variance indicate no significant effect for the interactions (P<0.05, is this probability of the interactions?). It is not clear if you have considered all the interactions as you have considered 2x4 factorial, yet with 16 treatments, as mentioned above, you have 2x4x2. Tables 2 and 3 considered the same title with average mass (table 3) change in the table 2. Table 5, the results did not show if the means for all the factors are significantly different or not, and which level of significance? Line 211 Change the reference with [9] to be consistent with the reference citation procedure. Lines 292-293, the net income of US\$ 10,299.36 for the two harvests at 64 and 104 DAP per ha obtained for each harvest, or is the value of two? How many tillers for this case? Your NIs are much higher for harvest at 73 DAP, except for with cut with all tillers. You do not relate or compared the results of [11] with you results!?	The author [22] or [11] (in the old version of the manuscript) does not measure the number of tillers that were planted and the value obtained was in the two harvests as written in the manuscript.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	It is not indicated in the introduction or in the discussion section how harvesting time 73 DAP or 100 DAP will influence the quality of the harvested product and if this will affect the consumer choice, thus the price of the product. Also, nowhere the choice of these times 73 and 100 DAP was explained, what the reason for choosing when the only reference [11] on harvesting time of chives indicated harvest at 64 and 104 DAP. Reference to grass [1], [2] and [13]; ornamental grass rosemary [12] and [15], sugarcane [14]; bean plant [16]; fruit plant [7]; eucalyptus [3] Reference [19] is incomplete.	Ok, thank you!