

Review Form 1.8

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

Compulsory 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>
Is the manuscript important for scientific community? <i>(Please write few sentences regarding this manuscript to justify your answer)</i>	Yes, the manuscript provides valuable insights into the knowledge level of sugarcane growers regarding integrated weed management practices in Meerut, which is crucial for improving agricultural productivity and sustainability.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is suitable as it clearly indicates the focus of the study.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	The abstract provides a concise summary of the study, including its objectives, methodology, and key findings. However, it could benefit from a brief mention of the implications of the study results.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate and follow a logical flow from introduction to conclusion.	
Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? <i>(Please write few sentences regarding this manuscript to justify your answer)</i>	Yes, the manuscript appears to be scientifically sound. The methodology is well-explained, and the results are clearly presented and discussed.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	The references are sufficient and recent, reflecting the current state of research on the topic.	
Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is generally clear and suitable for scholarly communication, but there are a few grammatical errors and awkward phrasings that should be corrected for better readability.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is well-written and provides valuable information. The authors may consider elaborating on the practical implications of their findings in the conclusion section.	

Review Form 1.8

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:	Umme Thahira Khatoon
Department, University & Country	National Institute of Technology, India