

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_102172
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of fertility levels and weed management practices on weed species and weed dry matter accumulation.
Type of the 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community 2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable 3. The abstract of the article is not comprehensive 4. The subsections and the structure of the manuscript are not appropriate. 5. No. I do not think that the manuscript is scientifically correct. 7. Not, the references are not sufficient and not recent, See the attachment	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. I see that yes, the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments	I see that the manuscript has to do a serious major revision	

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:	Aziz Benhamrouche
Department, University & Country	Ferhat Abbas University Setif1, Algeria