

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_120470
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF TILLAGE AND WEED MANAGEMENT ON YIELD AND NUTRIENT UPTAKE BY MAIZE
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The theme studied becomes important in the fight against weeds, a real scourge for the development of crops of capital importance such as corn. This work popularizes other methods of combating weeds and thus ensures optimal exploitation of the nutrient potential of the soil by crops with a view to high yield.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is suitable	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract would gain in readability and understanding if it were introduced by a general idea of the study. It also suffers from shortcomings in the presentation of the methodology. A concluding sentence to present the usefulness of the results is required.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The methodological part does not sincerely present the statistical analysis aspect of the study, essential to the analysis and understanding of the results. - The references to tables in the text have been sufficiently missed - The results were not sufficiently detailed, no figures, no probability values, no average indicated allowing better monitoring of comments and discussions of the results. - The usefulness of the results, the novelties offered by the studied weed management processes, their shortcomings and the prospects of the study are missing. - An overly simplistic conclusion is also presented. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. =	A third of the references are less than 10 years old out of 27, only 5 date from the last century and none from 2020. Efforts still need to be made to reach at least 50% of recent references.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English quality of the document is suitable for scientific communication.	
Optional/General comments	Other specific comments were presented in the manuscript under review.	

Review Form 3

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nodiet Melody Dahou
Department, University & Country	University of Abomey, Benin