

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_104434
Title of the Manuscript:	Herbicidal management of Cuscuta spp. In Berseem (Trifolium alexandrinum L.)
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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript could not be important for the scientific community as well as policy makers/decision makers to review strategies and to plan for interventions that can lead to crop production, food security and economic boost. The title appears not to be short, catchy and sound but is not complete as it does not say what "Berseem" is as one would think is a place elsewhere. I would, therefore, like to propose an addition of the word "Crop" at the end. Encouraging efforts have been made to come up with an Abstract that highlights major points of the research. The Author is, however, requested to avoid confusing the readers with lots of figures/numbers. Note that not all reader could be technocrats who could understand scientific words but could be influential in informed decision making. The structure of the Manuscript appears to be a traditional one but needs to be reworked and beefed with additional facts especially the Introduction Section by including other studies done on a similar effort elsewhere. The sub-structures in Section 3 need to be numbered and introduced properly for easy understanding of what is contained in it. I feel the manuscript has some data that can warrant it to be scientifically correct. I would, however, request the author to backup some of the data presented in Section 2 with references. No mention has been made of the analysis package used in the analysis of data generated to ensure its credibility and validity. Note that some of the facts presented in the document need to be backed up by references and this has been mentioned in the track changes of the document (See comments in track changes). <p>The Manuscript has a total of only 21 references on the list and all of them have been used in the document. I would, however, request the author to be consistent in the presentation of references in the number either numbers or names and not combining. If the author opts for names, then it should be in alphabetical order.</p> <p>The author is requested to consider reviewing reference number 1 as commented in track changes.</p> <p>The conclusion part needs to be reviewed and it should be consistent with what was supposed to be provided for in the whole document. I feel the issues related to the work have not been spelt out clearly from the word go. This could be in line of providing the aim, main objective and specific objectives. This was an opportunity for the author to justify the study, therefore, the idea was supposed to be clearly re-stated and supported according to the findings of the review.</p> <p>All the abbreviations/acronyms/symbols should be written in full followed by the abbreviations/acronyms themselves when they appear in the document for the first time, thereafter, the abbreviations/acronyms/symbols can be used.</p> <p>Avoid short/brief sentences that are not making sense and connecting very well as observed in some Sections and sub-sections (see my comments in track changes).</p> <p>Consider numbering all the Sections/Sub-sections including the reference Section or adding page numbers for easy referencing.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	Tables and figures should be well introduced in the document and be located closer to where they have been mentioned and introduced for better referencing not the way it has been done in this manuscript.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The answer could be no as well as yes and comments have been made to this regard. Please refer to the comments in track changes. Proofreading of the whole document to correct the grammar, typos, tenses etc including rephrasing/reconstruction need to be enhanced.	
Optional/General comments	All the sections need to be reworked as I feel the work was approached casually, except for the Results and Discussion and Abstract sections, all the others are too brief. I have made a number of comments to almost all the sections of the manuscript. As such and basing on the extent of my comments, I feel the manuscript could be under the minor revision range. All in all, the manuscript needs to be repaired basing on the deficiencies, some of which have been mentioned in addition to the track changes provided in the attached document. It is a good study that can help both the government and community in being focused and in changing their policy direction towards crop production to ensure maximising crop production. However, there is a need to provide more details to the study and this should include well spelled out problems/challenges as well as the proposed way forward based on the experience generated from the study and other studies done in the region and beyond as evidenced by the references included.	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	James Peaches Phiri
Department, University & Country	Malawi