**Editor’s Comment:**

In the revised manuscript, the author(s) have tried to revise the manuscript based on the reviewer’s comments. However, after going through the manuscript, I find that several important aspects were missed in the initial round of review. I had marked most of my comments and changes directly in the annotated manuscript.

* References are not cited for most of the information presented in the introduction. Further, the introduction fails to summarize previous information on the different methods that are used in the control of weeds in the rice fields. Moreover, there are various previous studies in this line (e.g., Choudhary et al. 2022, https://doi.org/10.1080/03650340.2021.1937606; Saha et al. 2021, https://doi.org/10.3390/agronomy11020389; Nagargade et al. 2024, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-56945-y; Das et al. 2024, https://doi.org/10.23910/1.2024.5354; Liu et al. 2023, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fcr.2023.108852; Saravanane et al. 2021, Indian Farming, 71(04): 61-64; Pratap et al. 2023, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cropro.2022.106100; Kokilam et al. 2023, http://dx.doi.org/10.18805/IJARe.A-5586), therefore show what the previous studies missed that prompted the need for the present study.
* Revise the methods with additional details. Information like the geographical coordinates of the experimental field, plot size, details of the soil type and soil characteristics, whether the experiment was performed over the same plots over the three years, cultural practices, climatic conditions during the experimental period, and identification and authentication of the weeds are missing.
* Parametric analysis, like ANOVA, requires a normal distribution of data. So, mention if the data were checked for homogeneity before statistical analysis, or any transformation was done to normalize the data. Moreover, mark the significance of variation in the tables using the alphabet.
* Tables should be self-explanatory. Therefore, explain all the abbreviations mentioned in the tables. The explanation for the treatments is not necessary in the Tables and refers to the methods for treatments.
* The results are not adequately discussed. Thoroughly discuss how each result aligns or contrasts with previous studies, and explore the possible reasons for these findings. For instance, discuss the mechanism by which the mechanical method controls weed populations effectively than the other methods.
* Much of the discussion is speculative and lacks supporting data. For instance, there is no evidence to back the assertion that competition from weeds diminished the leaf area index in the weedy check treatment. This, in turn, allegedly resulted in reduced light transmission and biosynthate production, ultimately leading to a decrease in dry matter.
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