

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_128225
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of weed management practices on yield and economics of wheat (Triticum aestivum L.)
Type of the 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: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	Wheat is important crop in that country and else were in the world Weed computation is the major gap of the production constraint Cultural practice like hand weeding is crucial to enhance wheat productivity	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	In need modified as commented	
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.	good with major improvement	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	If all necessary comment will be incorporated	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No matter	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Of course good but it could grammatically checked	
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ketema Bekele Hirpha
Department, University & Country	Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural Research (EIAR), Ethiopia And Bako National Maize Research Center (BNMRC), Ethiopia