

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_104922
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficacy of new generation herbicides in soybean (Glycine max. L)
Type of the Article	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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/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>The manuscript highlights the results of application of some novel herbicides on weed flora and yield of soybean. The results may provide valuable insights in the use of different herbicide combination in soybean.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No, the abstract lacks the details of the treatments and directly presents the results. A brief introduction of the study may also be included indicating the need to carry out this particular research.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, but needs major revision. The material and methods lack some important information like calculation of weed density, harvest index, etc. Under the discussion section, at many places, it is simply mentioned that the results are in line with the findings of.....without providing the reasons for such results. The effects of different herbicide treatments on yield components and yield are missing in the conclusion.</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	There are grammatical errors at some places in the manuscript.	
Optional/General comments		

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bhawna Babal
Department, University & Country	CSK Himachal Pradesh Krishi Vishvavidyalaya, India