



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_31813
Title of the Manuscript:	Enlist Weed Control Systems for Controlling Horseweed (<i>Conyza canadensis</i>) in Enlist Soybean
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>)



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	Introduction The introduction does not present a logical sequence. Suggestion to organize a history of cases of resistance in the USA. It can start from the adoption of no-tillage with a single mechanism of action and emergence of resistant species. Suggestions in minor revisions Material and methods Note the lack of information as methodology to obtain the height and density of the plants of Conyza Canadensis). Other information was not used in the discussion as soil data. Suggestions in minor revisions In relation to herbicides, it is suggested to use only the active ingredient. Delete commercial brands. This information demonstrates a conflict of interest. Suggestions in minor revisions Results and discussion It presents some paragraphs that should be in the methodology of the study. Suggestions in minor revisions Conclusions Presents some paragraphs that should be in the discussion. It does not list conclusive information regarding the objective of the study. Suggestions in minor revisions Partially. I suggest removing trademarks and modifying conclusions Please clarify the ethical issue if any.	Modified the introduction. Added statement to clearly state how plant height was measured and plant density. In other more common weed science journals, there is a requirement to include this information even if it does not impact results. It allows readers to see whether the sites would fit within their geographic region. Request that the information remains in table. Changes made to use active ingredients as requested. Though we do see a need to help decision makers to be able to more readily access and read technical information. In the US., retailers have surpassed university extension agents in assisting growers with weed management decisions. Additionally, labeling for new herbicide traits are restricting the use of "generic" products. The use of trade names are becoming more important in communications to align with EPA requirements. The journal should consider regulatory positions and need to specify products as these new traits come to the market. Additionally, the number of actives in a product is increasing which increases the size and complexity of treatment tables. The use of unofficial abbreviations for common



SDI Review Form 1.6

		names which have been used in journal articles are more complex and confusing than if product names are being used. The original paragraphs in the conclusion have been moved to discussion and a single paragraph added as the conclusion.
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	Line 10 e 11. The species <i>C. canadensis</i> has wide distribution and occurs mainly in temperate and subtropical regions of the northern hemisphere and the southern hemisphere subtropics. see reference: HOLM, E. et al. World weeds: Natural histories and distribution. Toronto: John Wiley & Sons, 1997. p. 226-235 Line 95. "By 2003... Link this paragraph to that of line 40. Suggestion: to organize a history of the cases of resistance in the USA and to relate the increase of cultivation in the system of no-tillage and changes in the mechanisms of chemical control with repeated applications of glyphosate. Line 125. It was not possible to correlate soil data with the occurrence or control of <i>Conyza canadensis</i>. Line 137. CO2 pressurized backpack. verify. Line 137. Table 1 "Height" Average height? "Density" Describe in methodology how these data were obtained. Line 148. Table 2. Suggestion: Trade names should be removed from the discussion. Prioritize only active ingredients. Table 3 e table 4. Suggestion: Trade names should be removed from the discussion. Prioritize only active ingredients. Line 172. Cite reference of this methodology of percentage notes or scale. Line 242. This information should be in the methodology. If the correlation data between growth stage and control are not presented I suggest to remove this information. Line 245. "In 2014..."Check this information. Studies have shown that applications in early stages favor the control of	Line 90: Change made as this paragraph was removed and portions combined with paragraph in line 40. Line 125: We did not attempt to correlate soil data with control. The sites were are random effect in the statistical model. In such, see no reason to include this statement. Line 137: Check information and one site used compressed air so made change to reflect. Added description of method for plant height and density Made change to common names throughout Line 172: added cite. Line 242: removed to simplify as the data does not impact the original intent of the study. Line 245: removed same as line 242. However there is a cite provide by Kruger that agrees with statement control with 2,4-D or dicamba was not affected by size between 2 and 30 cm.
---------------------------------------	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<i>Conyza canadensis.</i> Line 283. Conclusions. There is no conclusion according to the objectives of the study. I suggest to be conclusive in relation to the rotation mechanisms of chemical mechanisms for the control of horseweed. Line 284 -291. This paragraph is not a conclusion. It should be inserted into the discussion. Line 306. This paragraph is a discussion, not a conclusion.	Line 283: Edited conclusion as previously mentioned.
Optional/General comments		