

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_119041
Title of the Manuscript:	Phytotoxic response and variation in yield traits for post emergence herbicides in chickpea (<i>Cicer arietinum</i> L.)
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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1) Yes, if written to show the contribution in science</p> <p>2) The title is too general – the manuscript is about evaluating the response of chickpea to two specific herbicides. The title should indicate the focus.</p> <p>3) Abstract is very scanty</p> <p>4) No</p> <p>5) The manuscript has no Results – the author(s) explain the results, yet those results have not been presented</p> <p>6) The references are limited – the work is not thoroughly thought out.</p> <p>In such a study, the main concern is the spectrum of weeds that can be controlled by a herbicide product. Then the second concern is the tolerance of the crop to be protected. It is defeating to evaluate crops for herbicide resistance with little regard to the weeds they control.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Too long sentences, some with obscure meaning, and poor sequencing in delivery.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The manuscript requires rewriting with clear focus, and authentic results presented and accompanied by appropriate explanation.	

PART 2:

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

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