



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_38451
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Clodinafop-Propargyl and Mesosulfuron-methyl herbicides on wild oat ( <i>Avena ludoviciana</i> ) control under moisture stress condition
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>)

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Authors analysed the effect of drought on plants and changing the status of the plant, i.e. transport, photosynthesis, etc. The experimental part should contain detailed information about the impact of drought and the explanation of water stress doses. It should also describe in detail the substances of the herbicides and their mechanism of action. The comparison of these data will allow to obtain a comprehensive picture.	Thanks to the respected reviser for the careful study of this article.
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Line 35-36 – correct the text  There is no a purpose of the research  Materials and methods must include in-depth information about statistical design. Please, supply all the figures with statistical description (for example, $M \pm m$ , $n=4$ ).  What was the age of oat plants?  Information about lighting in greenhouse is lacking.  Fig 1 is not clear at all; it should be amended to be more visualized and readable  Line 134 – why a dose of about 42 is mentioned? There is no the same dose in Fig. 3.  The results and discussion should be more deep.	Line 134, The predicted number is 42 in the graph
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The manuscript is very interesting, but authors have to specify certain points in it.	