Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_CJAST_111485**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Inter and intra row weed and its effect: A review**
Type of the Article	**Review**

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments **1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) **2. Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) **3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** **4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** **5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** **6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	**1. If the author or authors correct the errors in the text and give more richness to the content, it can be effective for the scientific community** **2. The article's content seems to be unrelated to its title, which is confusing. It would be helpful to either correct the title or explain the relevance of the content to it. Specifically, the article should address the differences between Intra and Inter weeds, and this should be reflected in the abstract and conclusion as well. If this is not possible, a new title that accurately reflects the article's content, such as "The Effects of Weeds and Their Importance in Control," would be more appropriate.** **3. As I mentioned the abstract is not related to the title** **4. "Please note that some headings include a number, while others do not."** **5. A scientific review needs a substantial amount of resources. Therefore, the article lacks a comprehensive review of resources.The most references are current but they are not sufficient for a review.** **6. As mentioned in the previous item also there are some references here that can help with the paper.https://doi.org/10.3390/agronomy12040910** , https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-1987(96)01076-8	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	**There are some errors in grammar, spelling and punctuation that need to be corrected.**	
Optional/General comments	**7. The conclusion is where authors Restate the problem statement addressed in the paper, Summarize their overall arguments or findings and Suggest the key takeaways from paper, they are not allowed to state any new subject or new references.**	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Fatemeh Borna**
Department, University & Country	**University of Khuzestan, Iran**