

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_125907
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficacy of new herbicide on weed population and weed control efficiency in scented and hybrid rice (<i>Oryza sativa</i> L.)
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> 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 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.	The aim of this study is very necessary and practical, in an attempt to reduce the most dangerous pests (weeds) that threaten agricultural crops. It is important to conduct this type of study to achieve the highest quality and quantity of agricultural crops. To meet the increase in population worldwide	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Comparative efficacy of new herbicide and micronutrient on weed control efficiency in scented and hybrid rice (<i>Oryza sativa</i> L.)	
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.	Yes, the abstract is comprehensive. I suggest that deletion this sentence (Result revealed that weed flora, weed dry weight, weed fresh weight, dry weight and weed control efficiency.) or rephrase it with the next one	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Some of them need modifications that I mentioned in the manuscript.	
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 is scientifically weakness, It is better for the researcher to diversify his scientific writing. When the entire scientific paper is written in one style, this is not good, and ultimately leads to the weakness of the paper. Also, It is necessary to point out the results of the second year. I don't see the results of the second year at all in the text or graphs, this is absolutely not correct. The results of scientific research must be for at least two years.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The manuscript is lacking in scientific references. Please add more scientific references.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, it is suitable.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sameh Shaban Abdelaty Hamouda
Department, University & Country	Alazhar University, Egypt