

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_124202
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Integrated Weed Management Strategies on Weed Density and Biomass in Rice (Oryza sativa L.)
Type of the Article	Original 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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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 authors have focused on Integrated Weed Management strategies in order to minimise the application of chemical weedicides in the cropping field. Similarly manual weeding is not always possible in commercial scale. Therefore, the authors studied manual, chemical as well as combinations to mitigate the weed flora in rice field.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is suitable to this particular manuscript.	
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.	All the information related to the experiment have been reflected in the abstract. However minor corrections are required which has been given in the manuscript.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, but needs correction which are mentioned in the manuscript as comments.	
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.	Some sentences in the manuscript are too long and illogical which as been mentioned for rewrite. However, the manuscript contains all the relevant information pertaining to the title. Different weedicides have been tried to control the weeds in rice field. Weed density and dry weight at different stages of crop growth are useful for other researchers in future.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Recent references have been included in the manuscript. But these are not in proper format and needs to be revised.	
Minor REVISION comments	Some illogical sentences have been detected which are mentioned in comments for correction	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	The article is informative based on the title. The author/authors have not follow the standard format for references before submission.	

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:	Niranjan Chinara
Department, University & Country	Odisha University of Agriculture and Technology, India