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 (Pennisetum glaucum 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)

Review Form 1.6

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	**Abstract.** Include numbers that support that a treatment is better; it's not enough to say it's better. Comparison should be made related to controls. Include abbreviations. **Introduction**. Accurate, with the right references and with the right objective. Include the basis for the selection of the different herbicides to be tested, related to previous work from other authors. **Materials and methods.** In general, there are adequate treatments and repeats. However, the following aspects must be completed: a) Specific location (geographic location coordinates). b) Type of soil. c) Area for each treatment and the corresponding repeats. d) How do you get the weedy check area? e) How do you get the weed free area? f) Type of area you used for treatments T_3 to T_9. g) Origin of herbicides. h) Origin of seeds. i) Parameters to be tested. j) Type of measurements, percent of the total and units. k) Statistical analysis. l) Basis for cost calculations must be included. **Results and discussion. It should be rewritten considering the following:** **a)** Include **r**eferences to tables in the text. **b)** Since the specific treatments are found in the tables, it is not necessary to mention them in full in the text, but only refer to the treatment number. **c)** It is important to always refer to the weed-free situation and the weedy check situation, which are hardly mentioned in the results and discussion. **d)** Include ratios between treatments (T_3 to T_9) and T_1 and T_2. **e)** Results should refer to the situation without and with weeds, and subsequently, compare between the different herbicides used at PE and PoE. In this way you have a more general view of the results. **f)** When comparing treatments, it should be indicated if there are significant differences between them, so at the end, a recommendation for use can be made. **g)** The use of different 2,4-D (dimethyl amine or Na salt) should be discussed. **h)** Comparison of results, related to other authors, should not only refer to whether they are similar or not, since it refers to another plant species where the effect of weeds should also be mentioned. **Tables.** SD must be included for each number so that it can be indicated whether or not there are significant differences between the different treatments. **Table 1.** Include number of plants used for the obtainment of results **Table 2**. Include reference to cost calculations.	
Minor REVISION comments	English should be reviewed as there are terms that are not adequate to express the results.	

Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	This work, focused in the management of weeds that produce great losses in Pearl millet, has interesting results. However, it has numerous problems that must be fixed before it can be published. The specifics are listed above. In addition, there are some references that are not included in the manuscript that should be included to improve both introduction and discussion. These are; a) P.P. Girase*, R.T. Suryawanshi, P.P. Pawar and S.C. Wadile. Indian Journal of Weed Science 49(1): 41–43, 2017. DOI: 10.5958/0974-8164.2017.00010.7 b) Charul Chaudhary, Seema Dahiya, Sarita Rani and Sheshnath Pandey International Journal of Chemical Studies 2018; 6(2): 2346-2350 c) L.M. Chaudhary, V.P. Usadadia, A.N. Chaudhary, J.H. Chaudhary and V.B. Mor. Eco. Env. & Cons. 22 (September Suppl.) : 2016; pp. (S5-S9) d) B.S. Kasana, J.P. Dixit and R.K.S. Tomar. Progressive Research – An International Journal Volume 13 (3) : 202-205, (2018) e) H.M. Bhuva* and A.C. Detroja. Indian Journal of Weed Science 50(3): 273–277, 2018.	

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)*	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Luz María Pérez Roepke***
Department, University & Country	***Universidad De Chile, Chile***