

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_117433
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect Of Different Herbicides on The Growth and Yield of Wheat (Triticum aestivum L.)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The screening of herbicides is important so as to realise better yields yet doing minimal damage to the environment. As wheat is an agroclimatic tolerant crop, it is necessary to invest in research to maximise on it as the demand for food security increases. 2. The title is appropriate but the same as DOI:10.20546/ijcmas.2020.904.053. Although there are no copyright issues, it can be modified for easier accessibility. 3. Abstract – The abstract should focus on the contents of the study hence the first sentence in not necessary. Research design used should be stated. 4. (i) Methodology – The methodology is more of a skeleton, missing the particular details. Line 1-8 is basically the background of the study area. - No mention of the research design used (ii) Results and Discussion – These are 2 significant parts of the study yet they barely cover 2 pages out of 13 pages of the manuscript. - It is very shallow considering that this is a study that involves measurements. - It is more of a discussion and the results are almost non-existent. - For clarity purposes, the discussion and results should be written as different sections. The tables and figures should be moved to the results section and reference should be made to these in writing. - The references in each of the subsections are introduced the same way, using the statement 'Similar results were observed by, noted by, reported by'. This highlights a lack of creativity in writing and one wonders whether the writer conducted proper secondary research to support or argue the points. (iii) Appendix - Titles should be within the same page as tables and figures 5. Unfortunately one cannot come to a conclusion due to the scarcity of details in writing. 6. Only 13 references, which is not sufficient at all. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Re-arrangements are necessary and requires a lot of improvement especially in terms of detailing the methodology, displaying the results and improving the discussion.	

[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:	Tenanile Dlamini
Department, University & Country	Prince of Songkla University, Eswatini