

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JABB_122670</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>ENHANCING THE GROWTH ATTRIBUTES AND YIELD OF PEARL MILLET THROUGH WEED MANAGEMENT</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

#### **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>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <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.	The manuscript is a simple paper on one year experiment. Weed management is an important practice. Here different sources were used for management of weeds	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title may be altered like- Weed management for enhancing growth attributes and yield of pearl millet	
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.	Yes	
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.	It is okay as different combinations of weedicides were used to see the effect on growth attributes and yield of pearl millet. Scientifically correct . The author has not taken the periodical records of the growth attributes. It could be done.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes but could be incorporated two to three more references to support the findings	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 2:**

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

#### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ranjita Bezbaruah</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Assam Agricultural University, India</b>