

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_99336
Title of the Manuscript:	Weed dynamics of fodder maize as influenced by different herbicides in Central India
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>)

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)	<p>The manuscript touches on the important aspect of livestock nutrition, however, I believe the author should have included environmental friendly treatments</p> <p>The author should remove the part in central India</p> <p>The abstract lacks how the treatments were applied and at what time. The abstract lacks conclusion as well</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>yes</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The author can look into editorial issues that seem to occur frequently In the document	
Optional/General comments	The conclusions are not supported by the data and are contradictory. The author has not accounted for major confounding factors that can affect the conclusion. I believe the author teller make his methodology to fit his study for easier understanding. The author should look into his data again (analyses) to clearly state which treatments were better. It seems what is presented are number of weeds collected per square meter	

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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Oliver Okumu
Department, University & Country	Hamelmallo Agricultural College, Eritrea