

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | International Journal of Plant & Soil Science |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_IJPSS_103787 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | AN INTEGRATED EFFECT OF WEED MANAGEMENT IN BLACKGRAM |
| 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://www.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p> | <p>1. Yes this kinds of research and their results for sure is important for scientific community</p> <p>2. Yes it is.</p> <p>3. yes its is ok</p> <p>4. it needs to explain more about statistical part</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct . Its lot of work like are doing around the world but I think it should be accomplished in other statistical design as I left comments in the text .</p> <p>7. Its needs to be updated in references part with more recently published work.</p> <p>8. In general its not very strong . work is good and can be enough for a scientific reported but as I mentioned before there is a problem with choosing correct statistical design. so results could be explained may be in different way .I left comments on text .</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>1. Yes</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>I left some suggestion on the text to dear author for next same researches .</p> | |

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Name: | Sepideh Hatami |
| Department, University & Country | Iran |