



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_45347
Title of the Manuscript:	Weed Control and Peanut Tolerance When Using Pyroxasulfone in the South Texas Peanut Production Area
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	Title: Not ok. Need to be revised. Abstract: Important information is absent. From abstract, it is hard to understand about the study treatments. Introduction: Study background information is not adequate. Study objectives are not clear. Materials and methods: Data collection procedure is not clear. Results and discussion: Not sufficient data. There is no weed data present. Results presentation style is not good. There are no treatments comparisons. Discussions are not adequate or not relevant to the results. Grammar mistakes throughout the manuscript. There is no continuation of information.	Changed Added statement about the 2 studies conducted. Sentence order changed. Wording changed to reflect objectives: For these reasons research was undertaken in the south Texas peanut growing region to determine peanut tolerance and weed efficacy with pyroxasulfone herbicide systems. Weed efficacy is based on plant density and growth. Not sure what section of data collection is not clear. Table 2 shows weed control data and subsequent discussion. No injury was shown in the south Texas studies and no differences in yield were noted with the untreated check compared with any herbicide system. However, some differences within herbicide treatments were noted. Not sure what grammar mistakes reviewer is talking about
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	I see the novelty of the study presented in this manuscript but the major problem is the lack of sufficient data and poorly written manuscript. I have some specific comments on manuscript pdf version.	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	