

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_121518
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Bentazone as post-emergence against weed flora of direct seeded rice (<i>Oryza sativa</i> L.)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript covers a good deal of agricultural ground. However, the authors must do their utmost to explain not only their methodology but also the results obtained. Efforts are also required for the discussion	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	yes, the title of the article is suitable	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Some parts of the summary need to be revised. For example, the authors showed that the 1600 g/ha dose would be more effective at controlling weeds than the higher doses of 1800 and 2000 g/ha. This is incomprehensible and inconsistent. The objectives of the study were not specified. Taking this into account the abstract will be complete	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript needs proper scientific rigor. it could be improved by the various comments I have made	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are recent	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	NO, The authors need to improve the language	
Optional/General comments	The abstract and methods need to be reviewed. The results need to be presented in the most comprehensible way possible. The discussion should be improved and well conducted. Authors should take into account the amendments and comments mentioned in the manuscript in order to improve the quality of the article.	

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 3](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sourabie Soumaila
Department, University & Country	Joseph KI-ZERBO University, Burkina Faso