

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_124377
Title of the Manuscript:	Allelopathic effects of residues of Fimbristylis dichotoma along with manures and fertilizers on the weed growth in boro rice
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>
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.	This study addresses the pressing need for sustainable agricultural practices by exploring innovative approaches to weed control that can enhance soil health and crop productivity. By integrating organic and inorganic methods, the research may offer valuable insights into environmentally friendly farming techniques, contributing to reduced chemical dependence and promoting biodiversity in agroecosystems. Furthermore, it provides a practical framework for improving weed management strategies, which is crucial for ensuring food security in rice production.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	The abstract is lengthy and lacks clear organization, making it challenging for readers to follow the main ideas. I recommend shortening the content by eliminating redundant phrases and simplifying complex sentences. Additionally, restructuring the information to follow a logical flow will enhance clarity and improve overall readability	
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.	This manuscript shows scientific robustness and technical soundness through its comprehensive methodology and thorough data analysis. The experimental design is well-structured, utilizing appropriate controls and replicates, which strengthens the validity of the findings. Additionally, the authors have effectively employed relevant statistical tools to analyze their results, providing a solid foundation for their conclusions. Overall, the manuscript presents a compelling and scientifically rigorous contribution to the field.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 3

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:	Mohammed Al-Jawasim
Department, University & Country	University of Al-Qadisiya, Iraq