

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_111105
Title of the Manuscript:	Productivity of Dry direct seeded rice as influenced by herbicide combinations
Type of the Article	Experimental

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>1. Even the references of the introduction are not actual, we know the importance aof rice crops. This fact makes this article important to scientific community.</p> <p>2. The title is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive, but it does not indicate the results of the experiment or the conclusion. It needs to be done.</p> <p>4. The sections are appropriated but the introduction needs to demonstrate actual dadas to support the importance and relevance of this study.</p> <p>5. I think that the manuscript is not scientifically correct, because of the follow reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The manuscript needs cite the references that supported the methods proposed to perform the experiment as, also cite the false negative and false positive control to the experiments. • It is also necessary to give the details of all measurements that was taken to evaluate the results in the experimental part – (example: How the grass density was measured? – it is described in results but, should be done in methods. / all other measurements were not described). • The results are not discussed upon literature dadas. <p>6. There are some appointments about the references:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The references are older than five years. It needs to be corrected, mainly in introduction. It needs to be actualized, since it was used to justify the actual importance of rice crops. • In introduction, the second and the last paragraphs are absent of reference. • There are references that are listed but are not present in the text. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is good.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Esther Maria Ferreira Lucas
Department, University & Country	Centro Federal de Educação Tecnológica de Minas Gerais, Brazil