Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Plant & Soil Science**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJPSS_130245**
Title of the Manuscript:	**"Weed management indices and its relevance in weed science research"**
Type of the Article	**Review 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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	**This manuscript holds significant value for the scientific community as it emphasizes the critical role of effective weed management in minimizing yield losses caused by weeds, a major biotic constraint in agriculture. By exploring various management strategies—cultural, mechanical, chemical, and biological—the study underscores the importance of selecting and evaluating these methods based on their performance under diverse conditions.**	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	**The title of an article should be concise, informative, and reflective of the content. Based on the abstract, the following observations can be made:** **The current title is not provided. However, if we assume the title is related to the keywords and summary of the abstract, it could potentially address: The impact of weeds on crop productivity. Weed management strategies and their evaluation. The role of weed indices in management.**	

Review Form 3

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 provides a general overview of the topic, but it lacks clarity, specificity, and flow. Additionally, some points could be refined or expanded to enhance comprehension and address gaps. Below are specific suggestions:** **Points to Add:** **Quantification of Impact: Include an estimate or example of the extent of yield losses caused by weeds to underline the significance of the problem.** **Objective Statement: Clarify the purpose or scope of the discussion. For example, specify whether the abstract focuses on the evaluation of weed indices or the comparative analysis of management strategies.** **Key Outcomes: Briefly mention any notable findings or conclusions related to the efficacy of management strategies or weed indices.**	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is largely scientifically correct but requires some revisions for clarity and precision. Below are observations and suggestions for improvement: Scientific Accuracy: The claim that weeds are "one of the most important biotic factors causing significant loss in crop productivity" is accurate and well-supported by agricultural research. However, specifying examples or providing quantifiable evidence (e.g., percentage yield losses) would strengthen the statement. The explanation of weed management strategies (cultural, mechanical, chemical, and biological) is correct but oversimplified. Providing examples of each method would enhance comprehension and depth.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references cited in the text provided are not listed, making it difficult to determine their sufficiency, relevance, or recency. However, the following suggestions could enhance the robustness of your review: Recent References: Incorporate studies published within the last 5–10 years to ensure the information is up-to-date, particularly regarding advancements in weed management practices and the development of novel weed indices. Key Research Areas: Include references discussing the evolution of integrated weed management (IWM) strategies. Cite studies on the use of remote sensing and AI-based tools for weed identification and monitoring. Highlight research exploring the ecological and economic impacts of different weed management approaches.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The text has a fair degree of clarity but could benefit from revisions to meet the standard expected in scholarly communications. Below are specific issues and suggestions for improvement: Grammar and Syntax: "Weeds are one of the most important biotic factors cause significant loss in crop productivity." Suggestion: "Weeds are among the most significant biotic factors causing substantial losses in crop productivity." "Weed competes with crops for various resources..." Suggestion: "Weeds compete with crops for various resources..." Consistency and Flow: The list of management strategies (cultural, mechanical, chemical,	
Optional/General comments	**No**	

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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Rohitashv Nagar**
Department, University & Country	**Career Point University, India**