

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_79654
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Pre and Post emergence herbicides application on Economics of Pearl millet (<i>Pennisetum glaucum</i> L.)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy>)

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	<p>The manuscript seems very short and proper references are not cited. Simultaneously, the major focus of the manuscript is only to present their results without providing the main cause of that affect. Just they provide that similar results were recorded by the previous researcher that is not a proper description about the your results.</p> <p>Similarly, in the introduction part the objective of the study is not appropriately represented.</p> <p>The status of soil fertility not provide in the material method.</p>	Comment accepted and considered
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The abstract should be complete in itself. So given treatment details. Also provide the respective parameters values. Similarly follow for the other parameters.</p> <p>There is no need provide detail about the significantly at par treatment in the abstract section.</p> <p>The introduction seems unorganized, short and study of previous literature is missing. Your are providing a argument statement regarding the use of herbicide but the citation is missing or its your personal observation. The more focus should be on the justification of your results not that your studies are similar to some previous researcher.</p> <p>The specific minor comments are provided in the manuscript file.</p>	Comment accepted and considered
Optional/General comments	<p>Preparation of the treatment detail.</p> <p>Elaborate the full from of any word once in manuscript and then the abbreviations can be used as usual.</p> <p>The manuscript can be accepted after the major revision in the manuscript.</p> <p>The specific optional comments are provided in the manuscript file</p>	Comment accepted and considered

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

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