

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_105012
Title of the Manuscript:	Strengths and Weaknesses of Non-chemical Weed Management Strategies in Vegetables Production
Type of the Article	Case study

### 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.journalajaar.com/index.php/AJAAR/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)
<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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This article provides important information concerning the strengths and weaknesses of non-chemical weed management strategies in vegetables production;</li> <li>- The title is adequate to the content of the article;</li> <li>- The abstract should be restructured, concise and informative, adequately explaining the research setting and issues. It should briefly describe the purpose of the work, the techniques and methods used, the main findings with important data and conclusions;</li> <li>- 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 and should be restructured. The results are interesting and important for researchers in relevant areas of agriculture, but not clearly structured and incomplete;</li> <li>- The purpose or goal of the work is within the journal's scope;</li> <li>- In the bibliography, there are many very old bibliographical references. I recommend the inclusion of a larger number of more recent studies on the subject and their insertion in bibliographic references.</li> </ul> <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"> <li>- The general presentation of the manuscript should be reviewed, the extra spaces between words or the lack of spaces between titles, subtitles, figures and text according to the requirements of the journal;</li> <li>- I recommend a revision of the manuscript according to the requirements of the journal (English, technical editing, bibliography, etc.);</li> <li>- 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;</li> <li>- 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.</li> </ul> <p>Based on the above mentioned, I recommend this paper for publication after performing the suggested corrections.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>I recommend a carefully check of the full manuscript to correct any grammatical or syntax error.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Daniela Stoin</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Life Sciences "King Michael I", Romania</b>