

**Review Form 3**

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

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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 findings in this manuscript are helpful for the scientific community mostly post graduate students and scholars in field of agriculture.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title should be 'EFFECT OF TILLAGE AND WEED MANAGEMENT ON YIELD AND NUTRIENT UPTAKE OF MAIZE"  OR  EFFECT OF TILLAGE AND WEED MANAGEMENT ON MAIZE ( <i>Zea Mays</i> ) YIELD AND NUTRIENT UPTAKE	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Replace carried out by conducted at.</li> <li>2. Short sentence about conclusion and recommendation should be inserted at last of abstract.</li> <li>3. Key words should be updated "nutrient conservation, cereals, herbicides, reduced tillage, weed infestations or perennial weeds"</li> </ol>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, structure of the manuscript is appropriate. But the author should check the journal format policy and follow it thoroughly.	
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.	For most of the part this manuscript describes many aspects of the experiments. However, the author should elaborate the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How the nutrient uptake by weeds measured</li> <li>2. Name of weeds and short classification of the area studied</li> <li>3. There is not mentioned any sort of irrigation. If it is rainfed area then how much and how many times the rainfall occurred during the growing season</li> <li>4. How the amount of water received by the experimental area was measured</li> <li>5. There is another crop "Cowpea" as intercropped. It should be given preference and highlighted as part of the study. In this manuscript the Cowpeas is remained quite hidden</li> </ol>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. =	Some references are too old. In case, the reference is to reflect the original formula or hypothesis then it is alright. But if it is reflecting some findings then it should not be quoted. Because that old reference may be used plenty of times in other studies. In short, at least five years old references should be quoted in this manuscript. No need to go too far in the past.  The main part of research is the continuity of the past experiments with additions or modifications. Too old references may not be considered as the continuation of those experiments and should be avoided in order to increase scientific knowledge.	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language is proficient and no problem with the scientific communication.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. In tables the T1, T2 and W1 etc. should be written as actual treatment, so that someone reading this should not refer to the context in the manuscript. The table should be self explanatory whole on its own.</li><li>2. LSD values and alphabets are missing to indicate how much a value is significant or different from each others in the table.</li><li>3. Interaction subsection in the results may be opted out and the findings of the interactions should be combined with results. There is no need of interactions sub-heading.</li></ol>	

### **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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Roohul Amin</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Bacha Khan University, Pakistan</b>