

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_113194
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of Different Herbicides on the Growth, Growth Attributes and Yield of Maize (Zea mays L.) under Central Plains Zone of Uttar Pradesh
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, for weed management strategy</p> <p>Needs re-phrasing, have given suggestions on the manuscript</p> <p>Yes, with the suggestions given</p> <p>Results section is split too much. Could combine the various attribute into a common sub-title e.g Yield & yield components to cover for cob weight, grain weight, and number of grains.</p> <p>Experimental procedures are not well articulated, and writing also needs to be improved to the science. Currently, it is wanting.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Needs a lot of improvement – I have given my suggestion</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The Introduction is unnecessarily long. It is an extended Literature Review, which should not be the case. It should be tailored to introduce the study – a brief about maize, its importance and then why the study was.</p> <p>Table presentation is poor: the reader should not be made to keep going back to find out what T1, T2, T3 Stands for. Actual treatments should replace the Ts. The Table grids should be removed and Table presented in professional manner</p> <p>Differentiate between conclusion and recommendation. The conclusion should be given, and then a recommendation may follow.</p> <p>Significant improvement in writing is needed for the manuscript to be acceptable for circulation</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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:	Erick Cheruiyot
Department, University & Country	Egerton University, Kenya