SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

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 metamitron**
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 *Chenopodium album* 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**	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Fortunato Pagnoncelli***
Department, University & Country	***Universidade Tecnológica Federal do Paraná, Brasil***