

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	The manuscript is very important as an original research work dealing with weed problems and its solution through integrated management practices using live mulches, brown manuring and herbicides in sorghum crop. I do recognise and appreciate the honest effort made by the author for recording challenges faced due to presence of weeds in sorghum crop and identifying different options of weed management through integrated approach. This article will also encourage the scholars to research more in future on weed management in sorghum in Kerala state.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Suggest slight changes in title including the agroclimatic region of the location, "Impact of Live mulch, Brown manuring and Herbicides on Growth and Yield of Sorghum (<i>Sorghum bicolor</i> (L.) Moench) in -----zone of Kerala"	
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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the abstract of the article is comprehensive 2. Abstract should be divided in different sun sections viz. Aims, Study design, Methodology, Results, Conclusion etc as per the journal recommendation. 3. All treatments with details and notation is not required in abstract mention only the important treatments in the abstract 4. No data is not required in abstract 	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	The manuscript is scientifically correct which is addressing practical problems sorghum cultivation due to weed competition. In the experiment an effort has been made to find out effective integrated weed management options in sorghum crop.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. References are sufficient and recent. However, some facts mentioned in the introduction needs reference support 2. 	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. The author repeated similar style and pattern in language when it comes to writing results and discussions. More diversity is expected in writing to avoid repetition in style of sentences.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. Suggest inclusion of some weed data (density and dry weight) to justify treatment effect on crop growth and yield</p> <p>2. In case of similar trend in growth parameters no need to describe separately in results which unnecessarily makes the manuscript lengthy.</p> <p>3. Suggest results and discussions writing more precise and compact avoiding repetition</p> <p>4. In results and discussions treatment details and treatment notation need not to be written each and every time. Either write treatment in details and or write T₁/T₂ etc later on.</p> <p>5. Was there any phyto-toxicity of herbicides on sorghum plants?</p> <p>6. Inclusion of the economic part like cost of cultivation, gross and net income and B:C ratio of individual treatments will give better justification for recommended treatment in conclusion</p> <p>7. Acknowledgments and authors' contributions is missing</p> <p>8. All the suggestions and recommendations made in the comment sections of manuscript draft need attention and rectification.</p>	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Madhavan Gnanasekaran</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, India</p>