



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_41082
Title of the Manuscript:	Production potential of three sorghum groups evaluated in two consecutive harvests
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	Abstract Use different sub-section names (Aims, Study design, Place and Duration of the Study, Methodology, Results and Conclusion), as given in the MS word SDI paper template. 1.Introduction - Saccharum spp (put in italic) - And in this production chain, there...(add the coma) - Sorghum bicolor (L.) Moench] (put in italic) 2. Material and methods - Figure 1: The title of the figure is placed below the figure. - Figure 1. Fig. 1., Figure 2. Fig. 2., Figure 3. Fig. 3., Figure 4. Fig. 4., Figure 5. Fig. 5., - The titles of the figures and tables as well as the first row of tables must be in bold. - The six... 655). They were - The provenance (place of obtention) of the plant material used in this study was not mentioned. - Manuscript should be write in sections (1. Introduction, 2. Material and methods / Experimental details / Methodology, 3. Results and discussion, 4. Conclusion, etc) and subsections. Read author's guideline and MS word SDI paper template. (For example: 2.1. Sites, 2.2. Experimental design, 2.3. Agronomic characteristics etc.) - 1g 1 g of the material - Kcal / kg. Kcal kg⁻¹. Ditto in the rest of the manuscript. - The Tukey... 5 %; for the variables that presented significance. Remove the barred part, use a mean comparison test imply a p <0.05 3. Results and discussion - Manuscript should be written in sections and subsections (example: 3.1. Agronomic characterization, etc.) - The cultivars of biomass sorghum, BD 7607 and BRS 716..., respectively (Fig.ure 2). - Fig.ure 2. Duration of the first crop and ... the total duration of the two cycles in days; (Remove the point at the end of the figure's title), ditto for Fig. 3, 4 and 5. - There was a significant effect of cultivars (factor 1) and cut-off time (factor 2). Remove the barred parts. - 52 t / ha 52 t ha⁻¹ Ditto in the rest of the manuscript. - It was observed a 94% 94 % matter..., 87% 87% reduction of crop for forage sorghum ... of 75% 75 % - In general... (Fig.ure 1). - In relation ... others (Fig.ure 3). Ditto in the rest of the manuscript. - When analyzing ... and 71.7 t / ha, respectively (Fig.ure 3). These ...only 25% 25 % of the total found in the main crop (Fig.ure 3). - When ... of 73.18% 73.18% and 55.93% 55.93%, respectively, being statistically superior to the other components; (Table 3). - The title of Fig. 5 must be placed below the figure. 4. Conclusion This work has no prospects	Abstract The different of sub – section names were placed in accordance with the document model provided. 1.Introduction Concord with the revisers and make the suggested corrections. 2. Material and methods Concord with the revisers and make the suggested corrections. 3. Results and discussion Concord with the revisers and make the suggested corrections. The plant material used was seeds and these were commercial and were obtained from the companies: Embrapa Milho and Sorgo and Ceres as it was placed in the text. 4. Conclusion The perspectives proposed in this work is the use of a long cycle material only in the harvest or try to cultivate the regrowth in environmental conditions more favorable to the culture of the sorghum so that it grows better.
Minor REVISION comments	This article is fairly well written. English syntax errors have been detected in the text. Re-reading of the manuscript is recommended. This manuscript is recommended for minor revision.	I approve these translated versions of references.
Optional/General comments		