

Review Form 1.7

6

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_JSRR_117838
Title of the Manuscript:	Management of Orobanche in Mustard
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.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/editorial-policy>)

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>Management of Orobanche in Mustard</p> <p>The manuscript is very crucial for the scientific community as it focuses Management of Orobanche in Mustard. It suggests for securing higher yield and net return keep mustard crop weed free (removal of all weeds including <i>Orobanche</i>).</p> <p>The title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>The abstract is not comprehensive enough as it fails to give the conclusion of the study, and also make recommendations based on the findings of the paper.</p> <p>The sections, subsections and structure of the paper are appropriate.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The references are not recent and most of the names listed in the reference list were not cited in the body of the paper.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, though the researcher should thoroughly go through the manuscript and correct various grammatical, writing, spellings, and punctuation errors.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>No Table lines for the top and bottom.</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:	Kalu Udo Emeruche
Department, University & Country	Michael Okpara University of Agriculture, Nigeria