



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_41808
Title of the Manuscript:	Productive aspects of tropical grasses under different soil water stresses
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 introduction no represent this manuscript, please write the introduction with more paper recent and de the journal with higt impact factor; Test Sckot Knott, its not adequately for this experiment. Review the test application.	The introduction of the manuscript was revised and redone according to the comments made by the reviewer of the journal. According to the commentary presented by the reviewer, it was elaborated a justification for the use of the Scott-Knott Test with data from this manuscript. There is an extensive bibliography applicable to multiple comparison tests. However, the most common procedures (Tukey test, Duncan, LSD) in some statistical analyzes present results difficult to interpret due to the ambiguity presented, which occurs when two treatments, considered as different from each other, do not differ from a third. Multiple comparison methods based on univariate cluster analysis eliminate this type of problem [1], aiming at separating treatment averages into homogeneous groups, maximizing homogeneity of objects or individuals within groups and maximizing heterogeneity between groups [2], one of these procedures is the Scott-Knott test [3]. In view of the above, the Scott-Knott test was different from the others because it allowed the grouping of the means into more homogeneous groups, allowing greater statistical inference about the data of the present study, avoiding the ambiguity and the complexity in the interpretation of the statistically equal means among each other and between the groups, allowing a clearer and simpler interpretation of the results for the reader, and obtaining more direct conclusions on the development of tropical grasses as a function of each water tension applied to the soil. References 1. Silva EC. Avaliação do poder e taxas de erro tipo I do teste de Scott-Knott por meio do método de Monte Carlo. 1998. 54p. Dissertação (Mestrado em Estatística e Experimentação Agropecuária) – Universidade Federal de Lavras, Lavras, 1998. Portuguese. 2. Ferraudo AS. Técnicas de Análise Multivariada. 2th ed. São Caetano do Sul: StatSoft South America, p.15-27, 2006. Portuguese. 3. Santos C. Novas Alternativas de Testes de Agrupamentos Avaliadas por meio de Simulação Monte Carlo. 2000. 85p. Dissertação (Mestrado em Estatística e Experimentação Agropecuária) – Universidade Federal de Lavras, Lavras, 2000. Portuguese.
Optional/General comments		