

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_99339</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Efficacy of sulfentrazone 39.6% as a pre emergence herbicide against weed spectrum of soybean (Glycine max L. Merrill)</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. 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1- The manuscript is very important for scientific community.</p> <p>2- The title of this article is not suitable and an alternative title is <b>Efficacy of sulfentrazone 39.6% and Pendimethalin as a pre emergence application against weed spectrum of soybean (<i>Glycine max</i> L. Merrill)</b></p> <p>3- The abstract of this article is comprehensive.</p> <p>4- Subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5- I think this manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6- The references are sufficient and most of them are recent but 29% of them is old.</p> <p><u>Additional suggestions/comments:</u></p> <p>1- Any latin name must be written italic in the whole manuscript.</p> <p>2- Fabaceae and dryland must be changed to Fabaceae and dry land respectively in the text..</p> <p>3- No must be written instead of no in the Tables.</p> <p>4- In 3.2 on the crop must be written instead of on crop.</p> <p>5- In Table 3 number of branches/plant must be written instead of branch/plant.</p> <p>6- Harvest index and tones must be written instead of weed index and tonnes respectively in the text.</p> <p>7- The first letter of state must be capitalized in the text.</p> <p>8- Abbreviations must be written complete when written in the first time such as DAS and DAA.</p> <p>9- Experimental site which mentioned in materials and methods need to reference.</p> <p>10- Herbicides treatments must be written instead of weed control treatments in the titles of the only figure and the four Tables.</p> <p>11- References number 3, 6, 8, 10, 11, 14 and 17 should be checked.</p> <p>12- Results and discussion are insufficient.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1- Language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</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>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mukhtar Abdel Aziz Mohamed Osman
Department, University & Country	University of Dongola, Sudan