

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_126016
Title of the Manuscript:	Live mulch, Brown manuring and Herbicides impact on Growth, Grain and Stover Yield in Sorghum ( <i>Sorghum bicolor</i> (L.) Moench)
Type of the Article	

#### General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

#### 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>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	The research contributes valuably to agricultural sustainability by assessing the effects of live mulch, brown manuring, and herbicides on sorghum growth, grain, and stover yield. However, the manuscript itself is not well-constructed, reflecting minimal effort in its preparation. It appears that no thorough review was done prior to submission. Given the urgency, I have reviewed it immediately, but a major rework is required. With two days of focused revision, the manuscript can be refined. I recommend a major revision and encourage the scholar to seek guidance from their advisor or a committee member to polish the submission.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Yes, it is suitable	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	<b>Use abbreviations for repeated treatments:</b> Introduce treatments fully once, then refer to them as T1, T2, T3, etc., for conciseness. <b>Keywords:</b> Select specific, technical terms that reflect the study's unique focus rather than common words. <b>Punctuation Adjustments:</b> In line 6, add a comma before "respectively"; in line 19, remove the comma.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	No, the structure of the manuscript and subsections are not properly constructed.	
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	The manuscript presents a comprehensive study on the effects of live mulch, brown manuring, and herbicides on sorghum growth and yield, which is critical for sustainable agricultural practices. The research is scientifically robust as it employs appropriate experimental design and statistical analyses to evaluate the interactions between these agronomic practices. The results contribute valuable understandings into optimizing sorghum production while minimizing environmental impact.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	No. Add some more references. Each and every data furnished in the manuscript should be cited properly and with recent data (Line 36).	

**Review Form 3**

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Grammatical mistakes notably was and were were used in wrong places. Suggest you to take time and present it well.</p>	
<p><b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments</p>	<p>Line 43 - Some more points regarding live mulch, brown manuring and herbicides can be added if possible in the introduction section as the points given are not sufficient. Add one more paragraph about your treatments to stand with the objective of your research            Line 43 - different weed management <b>strategies / practices</b> on growth            Line 44 - MATERIALS AND METHODS            Line 45 -96 Seems like Thesis. Try to follow the scientific way of writing. An Original research article writing is not like Thesis. Make it in article format            Line 70 – Keep package of practices (POP)            Line 76 – Keep POP            Line 97 - RESULTS AND DISCUSSION            You have just mentioned the results in wordings that are present in the table. The discussion part is only observed for days to 50 per cent flowering, grain yield and stover yield. Focus on discussion part which is very important for a paper. Citing the research papers instead of discussion is not a proper way of writing. Projects you are running away.             You have done a good work. Work still more to convert the effort to reach the scientific domain. Best wishes</p>	

**PART 2:**

	<p><b>Reviewer's comment</b></p>	<p><b>Author's comment</b> (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>
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Madahb Kumar Datta</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>Sri Sri University, India</b></p>