



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2015_AJEA_17278
Title of the Manuscript:	Weed dynamics in greengram (<i>Vigna radiata</i> L.) as influenced by mulching and weed management practices under eight year old custard apple (<i>Annona squamosa</i> L.) plantation in agri-hori- system*
Type of the 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Weed infestation remains the largest constraint limiting the productivity. Supply of pulses continues to be a problem in some regions. Another problem of great importance is environmental pollution due to synthetic herbicides. From this point of view every study on improvement of crop production is of importance. The data obtained in present study is valuable. Comments are included in the text in order to help the authors in manuscript revision. There are a lot of grammatical and technical errors. The authors should carefully revise the whole paper. Rows 3 and 4: The names of plants in the title need correction. Rows 5, 70, 77, 103, 108: The term agri-horticultural system should be used properly. Row 47: Units of measurement should be presented using System International (SI) units: The SI symbol for Mega is M, the tonne is "t"; megatonne – Mt; Mha. The study needs discussion and clear conclusion. Rows 57-59 are of great importance, but the results were not discussed from this point of view. Please, include the missing text in Rows 117. Please, correct the text that is too hard to be understood: Rows 188-190, 225-227. The Tables must be presented according to Journal instructions. Figures should be explanatory enough to be understandable without any text reference. In Figures abbreviations were used, but these were explained only in Table 4. The authors discussed in the text significance of the results, but there is no statistical significance in the Figures. There are some technical omissions in the Reference section. Conclusion should be added.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	There are some technical errors to be corrected.	
Minor REVISION comments	Introduction might be structured in a better way. For example: Ros 46-56, 68-69, 78-81 deal with Vigna plant; 57-68, 86-96 deal with weed protection management, 70-78 and 97-101 deal with agri-horticultural system.	
Optional/General comments	English language editor is recommended.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Asya Dragoeva
Department, University & Country	University of Shumen, Bulgaria