

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_107215
Title of the Manuscript:	Negative influence of Johnson grass (<i>Sorghum halepense</i> L) on yield of crops along with the strategies to suppress its growth with chemical and other management approaches – A Review
Type of the Article	Review Article

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> <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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This article provides important information regarding the negative influence of Johnson grass (<i>Sorghum halepense</i> L) on yield of crops along with the strategies to suppress its growth with chemical and other management approaches; 2. The title is adequate to the content of the article; 3. The abstract of the article is well written, adequately explains the research setting and issues; 4. The introduction does not provide an adequate description of the problem addressed and shows the significance of the research problem. The methodology used is not clearly described, should be restructured, providing a more detailed description. The results are interesting and important for researchers in relevant areas of agriculture; 5. The purpose or goal of the work is within the journal's scope; 6. I recommend the inclusion of a larger number of more recent studies on the subject and their insertion in bibliographic references. <p>However, some minor corrections should be made in order to publish the article. Please, take into account the following recommendations to improve this manuscript:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The general presentation of the manuscript should be reviewed, the extra spaces between words or the lack of spaces between titles, subtitles and text according to the requirements of the journal; - I recommend a revision of the manuscript according to the requirements of the journal (English, technical editing, bibliography, etc.); - I recommend a critical approach to the literature to enable analysis and interpretation of the information, development of an objective viewpoint and the setting of clear objectives; - I recommend the inclusion of a larger number of more recent studies on the subject and their insertion in bibliographic references and reviewing all bibliographical references and editing them according to journal requirements; - I recommend that the bibliographical references be edited as required by the journal (see: some are written this way (Travlos, I.S. <i>et al.</i> 2018), and others (Mark A. Czarnota. <i>et al.</i> 2003). - The presentation of the Conclusions is very short; - I recommend that conclusions be formulated highlighting the importance of the results obtained; <p>Based on the above mentioned, I recommend this paper for publication after performing the suggested corrections.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>I recommend a carefully check of the full manuscript to correct any grammatical or syntax error.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Daniela Stoin
Department, University & Country	University of Life Sciences "King Michael I" from Timisoara, Romania