

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Botany
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIB_97413
Title of the Manuscript:	Weed flora, density and efficiency affected Sugarcane ( <i>Saccharum officinarum</i> L) controlled by Chemical Herbicides.
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:

(<https://journalajrib.com/index.php/AJRIB/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Author(s) should revise the paper again for publication and improve the manuscript accordingly. The manuscript is important for scientific community, specifically Natural Science and relevant communities.</p> <p>Presentation: Good; need improvement in some cases.</p> <p>Abstract: Good enough. Some points are not clear. Use few statistical values to justify the text.</p> <p>Introduction: need improvement. Use references (where truly necessary). Need elaboration in few sections.</p> <p>Materials and Methods: Okay. Use proper citation.</p> <p>Data analysis: Mention the statistical value properly.</p> <p>Results: okay. Some changes required. Presentation of key findings using some graphs and figures is highly appreciated. Better to check the analysis again for perfection.</p> <p>Discussion: okay. Just compare the findings of the study with others precisely.</p> <p>Conclusion: Use more text to explain the key findings and concluding remarks.</p> <p>References: All the references must be arranged consecutively/serially in the text for better understanding and recheck according to the journal's guidelines. Some references do not cited properly. Author(s) have to check the reference section again. Highly instructed to use more and recent reference.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Few sentence structure and representation is not well-written. Author(s) should check the English language, typographical, grammatical errors etc. very carefully</li> <li>• Research idea: good</li> <li>• Do not repeat same idea, aspect, and sentence in different paragraphs. Better to represent differently. In some cases, need justification and explanation.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revise and improve the manuscript following reviewer's comments before final submission</li> <li>• Major revisions required</li> <li>• Need clarification in some points.</li> <li>• Reviewer encourages the author(s) to check each reference precisely, and arrange it perfectly according to the Journal's format for better representation. Statistical values should mention perfectly.</li> </ul>	

### PART 2:

	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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Shourav Dutta</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Rangamati Science and Technology University, Bangladesh</b>