

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_123639
Title of the Manuscript:	Weed growth and Productivity of Greengram (Vigna radiata L.) under Different Weed Control Practices
Type of the Article	Research 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>

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>General Comments</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The paper is well-organized and covers the topic comprehensively. • The data and analysis are presented in a structured manner, and the findings are relevant to improving weed management in greengram cultivation. <p>Introduction</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The introduction provides relevant background on the importance of pulses, particularly greengram, in India. • It highlights the problem of weed competition and the significance of effective weed management. <p>Suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The introduction could benefit from a clearer statement of the study's objectives and how it addresses gaps in existing research. • The citation format for some references (e.g., "Anonymous, 2019") could be improved by providing more detail or revising it to fit a standard citation style. <p>Materials and Methods</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The experimental design is well-detailed, including the location, soil characteristics, and specific herbicide treatments. • The methods for data collection and statistical analysis are appropriately described. <p>Suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would be helpful to include a brief description of the specific herbicides' modes of action or their relevance to greengram weed management. • Clarifying why the particular concentrations and application timings of herbicides were chosen would enhance the methodology section. <p>Results and Discussion</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The results are clearly presented with relevant comparisons between different weed control treatments. • The discussion effectively relates the findings to previous research, providing context and 	

Review Form 3

	<p>supporting the conclusions.</p> <p>Suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The discussion could further explore the potential reasons behind the varying effectiveness of the herbicides and weeding practices. • It would be beneficial to discuss any limitations of the study or factors that could influence the applicability of the results in other regions or conditions. <p>Impact Assessment</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The impact assessment section provides valuable insights into the effectiveness of different treatments using various indices. <p>Suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarifying the significance of each index (Weed Management Index, Agronomic Management Index, Integrated Weed Management Index) and how they were calculated would be helpful. • Comparing the effectiveness of the herbicide treatments in a more detailed manner could enhance the discussion of their practical implications. 	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>YES</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>Abstract</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The abstract provides a clear overview of the study's objectives, methodology, and main findings. • It effectively summarizes the comparative effectiveness of different weed control treatments and their impact on greengram productivity. <p>Suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The mention of a 58.17% reduction in rice yield seems out of context since the study focuses on greengram. This might be a typographical error or a mix-up with another crop. It should be corrected to reflect the impact on greengram. 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes</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>Paper is not robust its usual work</p>	

Review Form 3

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	References Latest references should be added and highlight how your study is different from others	
<u>Minor REVISION</u> comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Ok but can be improvised	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	-----	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Narendra K
Department, University & Country	Annamalai University, India