

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_100527</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Standardization of Weed Management Strategy for Chickpea (<i>Cicer arietinum</i> L.) under Different Levels of Crop Residue Retention in Conservation Agriculture</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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> )

## 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><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></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. <b>Yes, It is very important</b></p> <p>2. <b>Yes, the title of the article is suitable</b></p> <p>3. <b>Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive</b></p> <p>4. <b>Yes, there are appropriate</b></p> <p>5. <b>Yes, I do</b></p> <p>6.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Yes, it is suitable	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>1. In ABSTRACT: The experiment was laidout in a factorial randomized block designwith 16 treatments and replicated thrice It should be changed to: The treatments were arranged by factorial (4x4) in randomized block design with three reps.</p> <p>2. In MATERIAL AND METHODS It should be added: The treatments were arranged by factorial (4x4) in randomized block design with three reps. First factor were four levels of crop residue (0%, 30%, 60% and 90%) of previous crop (maize). The second factor were four herbicidal weed control treatments (H<sub>1</sub>- Imazethapyr @ 50 g a.i. ha<sup>-1</sup> as pre-emergence (PE) application, H<sub>2</sub> - H<sub>1</sub> followed by (fb) hand weeding (HW) 50 days after sowing (DAS), H<sub>3</sub> - Imazethapyr @ 25 g a.i. ha<sup>-1</sup>+Clodinafop @60 g a.i. ha<sup>-1</sup> 30 DAS, H<sub>4</sub>- H<sub>3</sub> fb HW 50 DAS.</p> <p>3. The overall result and discussion are good and connected to each other as scientific article</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><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>Kukuh Setiawan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>College of Agriculture, University of Lampung, Indonesia</b>