

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_115285
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of the Indoor Efficacy of Various Foliar-Applied Herbicides on <i>Sicyos angulatus</i> Seedlings
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	Yes the manuscript is important for the scientific community. The title "Evaluation of the Indoor Efficacy of Various Foliar-Applied Herbicides on <i>Sicyos angulatus</i> Seedlings" indicates a specific research study that evaluates the effectiveness of different foliar-applied herbicides on <i>Sicyos angulatus</i> seedlings indoors based on Specificity, Research focus and Methodological approach.	
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes the title is good. Here are some suggestions for the title "Assessing the Effectiveness of Different Foliar-Applied Herbicides on <i>Sicyos angulatus</i> Seedling Growth in Indoor Environments" can also be recommended.	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	Yes. The abstract of the article is comprehensive enough. But addition of one or two points relevant to research gap and keypoints about the selected crop will enhance the article in a scientific manner.	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Overall, that each section is well-organized, with a clear connection between different elements of the manuscript. Materials and methods need to be elaborated.	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	Yes, the methodology adopted in the system is scientifically acceptable. But the statistical tool used in the study and data analysis part needs to be addressed.	
6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.  <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	Yes the references in the manuscript are proper enough. But, the author need to incorporate one or two references related to the present and recent studies (2022&2023) in order to correlate with other sar scientific studies.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications. But, there is some minor grammatical mistakes in the article.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Inclusion of statistical tool and data analysis part will enhance the article in a holistic manner.	

### 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:	<b>S. Navaneetha Krishnan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, India</b>