

## Review Form 1.8

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEAI_120122</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>SUGARCANE GROWERS' KNOWLEDGE LEVEL ABOUT INTEGRATED WEED MANAGEMENT PRACTICES IN MEERUT (UP)</b>
Type of the Article	

### **General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.8**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Is the manuscript important for scientific community? <i>(Please write few sentences regarding this manuscript to justify your answer)</i>	<b>Yes.</b>	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes.	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>	<b>No. The author should revise the work base my comments and capture that in the abstract</b>	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	<b>No. The report is deficient in subsections and this make the manuscript very difficult to write and understand especially in the result and discussion section.</b>	
<b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> <i>(Please write few sentences regarding this manuscript to justify your answer)</i>	<b>No. The manuscript lack so many variables which makes it scientific. I will urge the authors to do more reading around the topic. This will expose them to many scientific writings which they can include in their work. They should refer to my comments in the work for more details</b>	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>	<b>The reference are not sufficient and recent also. Most of the statements are reference which is not a good writing style.</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes, but does not address the motive behind the	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	I suggest the manuscript be serious work to meet the standard of the journal.	

[Review Form 1.8](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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>John Aloba Atubiga</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Energy and Natural Resources, Ghana</b>