



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_38368
Title of the Manuscript:	Sensitivity of different Chenopodium album L. biotypes to metamiltrun
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	The article brings relevant information regarding the sensitivity of <i>Chenopodium album</i> biotopes to the herbicide metamitron. However, in order for it to be able to be published, some changes must be made. In the x-axis of the figures, it should contain the dose of the herbicide in kg / ha and not percentage of the product, otherwise it will mask important information, which is ED50. For charts where there is more than one regression line, a legend should be inserted indicating what each row represents. In figures 3 and 4, the columns are identified on the x-axis and in the legend, choosing only one mode. In the material and methods, it should be indicating which model of equation was used to adjust the curves A table indicating the parameters of the equations must be inserted. In Figure 5, the indication of the biotypes on the x axis does not correspond to any form presented in the material and methods. I recommend a restructuring of the Results and Discussion, the data should be better explored and comparisons with results already presented in the literature should be made. The objectives of the work should be reformulated	Noted Information is given in L/ha and kg/ha of active substance Modified Fig. 2, all other figures are clearly marked. Noted Modified Noted, not modified Noted, not modified Noted, not modified Noted, not modified
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		