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 (*Vigna radiata* l.) as influenced by mulching and weed management practices under eight year old custard apple (*Annona squamosa* 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** *(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	**Title:** The title is too long. Authors should submit a shorter title. **Abstract:** Authors should submit the summary, the objectives of the work and the conclusions based on the objectives. **Introduction:** Standardize throughout the text: kg ha^{-1};... 66 g / day / capita (66 g day^{-1} $capita^{-1}$) ... It is not common to cite the title in the introduction ... delete the lines 103-106 and enter the hypotheses of the work clearly. **MATERIALS AND METHODS** **2.3. climatic** No information was presented ... **2.5 Statistics** Very confusing ... authors should rewrite more clearly and succinctly. **3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION** Authors should rewrite the item results and discussion in a unified way. There are items and duplicate information. There is no padronizão the presentation of the units of measurement of the data. In the way the tables were constructed not allow the understanding of results. And compare them in the written text. The authors should provide a clear and objective conclusion. . The conclusions should answer the hypotheses and objectives of the study.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Anonymous**
Department, University & Country	**Universidade Estadual do Oeste do Parana, Brazil**