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 X	Introduction Line 71. Provide author name then give reference number in pharanthesis Same Line 73, 75, 78 Materials and Methods Line 117 only sugarbeet ? what about other fields mentioned in Table 2? Line 135: Fresh weigt was estimated ?? or determined by weighing? As dose-response curve shows (Figure 2) fresh weight data was converted to percent in relation to control. Is that true ??. If so add this to material method Results and Discussion Figure2. y axis is not response it looks as percent fresh weight, right ?. If so please correct Figure 2. is dose rate logarithmic or percent or what else ??. If logartithmic no correct information in pharantheses. Log dose 100 should not be equal to 5 l/ha of Goltix 700 SC Figure 2. Specify the curves with different colors. Which is biotype 81, 90 and from Belgium Figure 1 and 2, please show the replications (measured values) of replications Figure 3-4. No need to repeat mentioning the information in pharanthesis. It has already been mentioned in Materials and Methods (Line 128) Figure 3 and 4: You had different populations from different crops as well as growing systems (numbers are given Table 2). You have given only one value in graphics, what are these values ? Are they average values over all populations ?. Thats unclear. Did you collect seeds from different areas then bulked them and did dose-response experiments ? That's the main point I haven't understood Figure 5. why do you compare the sensitivities at two doses, why not whole dose response curves as well as ED50, 90 or other values ? and why only 15 biotypes ?? what about remining populations ? I would like to see tables with ED50, 90 values of all tested populations with other parameters such as slopes together with standard errors	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	**The aim of this study is clear but the methods are not compeletly clear, there are some points that I did not understand exactly. I have provided these information above**	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***M. Nedim Doğan***
Department, University & Country	***Faculty of Agriculture, Adnan Menderes University, Turkey***