

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_118376
Title of the Manuscript:	Bio-efficacy evaluation of herbicides for weed management in rabi onion
Type of the Article	Research

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 1.7

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"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The manuscript is important for scientific community, especially within the field of agriculture and crop management</p> <p>The title Bio-efficacy evaluation of herbicides for weed management in rabi onion is suitable</p> <p>Yes, the abstract is comprehensive, it is concise and informative. It outlines the key aspects of the study, including the experimental setup, herbicide and treatments, and results related to weed control and yield. However, to enhance comprehensiveness, additional details could be included, such as the specific herbicides used, the magnitude of yield reduction, and any notable findings.</p> <p>The manuscript follows a logical flow, addressing the research objectives and providing relevant context. Researches and practitioners in the field of agriculture and crop management will find this structure informative and relevant</p> <p>The manuscript titled "Bio-efficacy evaluation of herbicides for weed management in rabi onion" appears to follow a standard scientific structure, including details on the experimental setup, herbicide treatments, and soil characteristics. The use of randomized block design, specific onion variety (GJRO-11), and herbicide application methods align with common agricultural research practices.</p> <p>Citations play a crucial role in scientific manuscripts, providing evidence, context, and connections to other research. While the references provided here cover relevant studies on weed management in onions, I recommend considering a few additional recent references to enhance the comprehensiveness of this manuscript:</p> <p>Recent Herbicide Studies: Include studies published within the last 2-3 years that specifically address herbicide efficacy, novel formulations, or alternative weed management strategies for onions.</p> <p>Regional Studies: Explore research conducted in different regions or countries to capture diverse perspectives and practices related to onion weed control.</p> <p>Integrated Weed Management: Look for references that discuss integrated approaches, combining chemical, cultural, and biological methods for effective weed management.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language and English quality seem suitable for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Yusuf Hajara Oyiza
Department, University & Country	Nigeria