

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_123406
Title of the Manuscript:	Integrated Weed Management of mustard crop (Brassica juncea L.) under mid-hill region of Himachal Pradesh
Type of the Article	

[Review Form 3](#)

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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The research titled "Integrated Weed Management of Mustard Crop (<i>Brassica juncea</i> L.) under Mid-Hill Region of Himachal Pradesh" is of considerable importance to the agricultural scientific community, as it tackles a critical challenge in the cultivation of mustard, a prominent rabi oilseed crop in India. This study presents valuable insights into the efficacy of various weed management strategies, including the application of herbicides and manual weeding, which are essential for enhancing crop productivity and promoting sustainable agricultural practices. The manuscript is commendable for its thorough methodology and data-driven findings, which provide practical applications aimed at increasing crop yields and mitigating losses associated with weed competition. Nonetheless, the work could benefit from a more comprehensive examination of the environmental consequences associated with the herbicides employed</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title "Integrated Weed Management of Mustard Crop (<i>Brassica juncea</i> L.) under Mid-Hill Region of Himachal Pradesh" is generally suitable, as it clearly indicates the study's focus on integrated weed management practices for mustard in a specific geographic area.</p> <p>However, if you wish to make it more concise or slightly broader in scope, an alternative title could be: "Integrated Weed Management Practices for Mustard (<i>Brassica juncea</i> L.) in Himachal Pradesh's Mid-Hill Region".</p> <p>This version maintains clarity while streamlining the language.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract of the article presents a thorough overview, effectively summarizing the essential components of the research, including its objectives, methodology, and findings. It succinctly details the study's design, geographical context, treatments administered, and highlights the primary conclusion, which identifies the most effective strategy for weed management. This summary offers a coherent insight into the research conducted.</p> <p>Nevertheless, there are several areas for enhancement:</p> <p>Incorporation of specific metrics: Introducing more quantitative information in the results section, such as precise statistics on weed control effectiveness or yield enhancements, would significantly strengthen the abstract's impact.</p> <p>Clarification of objectives: The stated aim could be elaborated to underscore the study's importance, particularly in terms of promoting sustainability or maximizing mustard crop yields.</p> <p>Consideration of future implications: Including a brief discussion on how the results might inform subsequent research or agricultural practices in comparable regions would increase the study's relevance for the audience.</p> <p>In summary, while the abstract is robust, it could be enriched by integrating these additional elements to provide greater depth.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript appear appropriate for a scientific paper, as it follows a standard format that includes the following key components:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abstract: Summarizes the study's objectives, methods, results, and conclusions concisely. 2. Introduction: Provides background information on the topic, highlighting the importance of mustard farming and the weed management challenges. 3. Materials and Methods: Clearly explains the experimental design, treatments, and data collection process, making it replicable for future studies. 4. Results and Discussion: Discusses the findings, supported by data, tables, and figures, and relates them to previous research. 	

Review Form 3

	<p>5. Conclusion: Summarizes the key takeaways and provides practical recommendations.</p> <p>The structure effectively facilitates the logical flow of information from background to methodology, results, and interpretation. However, one potential improvement could be to separate the Results and Discussion into distinct sections for greater clarity and emphasis on both the findings and their broader implications.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript demonstrates a high level of scientific integrity and technical precision, attributable to its meticulously organized experimental framework and stringent methodological approach. The implementation of a randomized block design (RBD) effectively reduces variability among the experimental plots, while the incorporation of various treatments and multiple replications bolsters the credibility of the findings. Additionally, the manuscript features extensive data collection throughout different phases of crop development, which is essential for evaluating the long-term efficacy of weed management strategies. The statistical methods utilized for treatment comparison offer a solid foundation for drawing informed conclusions, thereby enhancing the study's scientific validity. Collectively, these elements indicate that the manuscript adheres to recognized research standards and yields trustworthy results.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>⋮</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript cover a good range of studies relevant to weed management and mustard crop cultivation, including foundational research and recent findings. However, some of the references cited, such as those from 2013 or earlier, might be considered outdated in the context of rapidly evolving agricultural practices and herbicide resistance issues.</p> <p>To improve the manuscript's relevance and ensure it reflects the latest advancements in the field, it would be beneficial to include more recent studies from the past 5 years, particularly on topics such as sustainable weed management, the ecological impact of herbicides, and integrated pest management. Including newer references can provide a more current understanding of trends and innovations in agricultural weed control practices. Some relevant journals to explore include:</p> <p>Weed Science Agronomy for Sustainable Development Pest Management Science</p> <p>Incorporating references from these sources will enhance the manuscript's scientific depth and contemporaneity.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication, but there are some areas where improvements could be made. The manuscript effectively communicates the research, but some sentences are lengthy and could benefit from clearer phrasing and more precise word choices. Additionally, occasional grammatical issues, such as awkward sentence structures, might affect readability.</p> <p>To enhance the quality of the language, I suggest a careful review focusing on simplifying complex sentences, improving transitions between ideas, and correcting minor grammatical errors. Overall, with minor editing, the manuscript can meet the standard for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Some general comments for improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Consider breaking up the Results and Discussion section into separate parts to make the findings easier to digest and interpret.2. Expanding on the environmental implications of herbicide use and providing suggestions for balancing effective weed control with sustainable agricultural practices would enrich the discussion.3. Including more recent references would further strengthen the study's relevance and scientific impact. <p>These adjustments would help elevate the manuscript's clarity and contribution to the scientific community.</p>	

PART 2:

	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>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:

Name:	Aashish Gyawali
Department, University & Country	Tribhuvan University, Institute of Agriculture and Animal Science, Nepal