

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ IJPSS_124388
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF WEED MANAGEMENT ON YIELD QUALITY AND ECONOMICAS OF SUMMER GROUNDNUT ( <i>Arachis hypogaea</i> L.) UNDER SOUTH GUJARAT CONDITION
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**

<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.	This manuscript is very important for the scientific community. I like this manuscript because weed manage such as manual weeding at some times and application of some herbicides in it increased significantly yield quality and economic of summer groundnut.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is suitable but the word economicas must be written economic or economical.	
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 of the article is comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.	
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.	I think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound because the researcher followed scientific methods in the methodology and the writing.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and more than 70% of them are recent.	

**Review Form 3**

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p><b>I think the English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</b></p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p><b>Optional/General comments:</b></p> <p>1- The first letter of state must be capitalized.          2- In 3. Material and methods, material must be written Materials.          3- In Table 2 Number of pods/plants, the letter s must be deleted from plants.          4- The experiment must be conducted for two summer seasons.          5- The data have not analysed.          6- In 3.1 under 3. Results and discussion, the word in must be written between the two words seen and the.          7- In the end of the first nine lines which mentioned in 2. Materials and Methods, reference must be written.          8- In the last line of 3.3 Yield and yield attributes, the word of must be written before the authors.          9- The abbreviations when have been mentioned at the first time, they must be written entirely and they must be written between two brackets.          10- In the references list, the third reference (Donald and Hamblin (1976) and the eleventh reference (Panse and Sukhatme 1967) must be mentioned in the text.          12- The discussion is insufficient.</p>	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Mukhtar Abdel Aziz Mohamed Osman</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>University of Dongola, Sudan.</b></p>