



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		
Minor REVISION comments	The study presents interesting results for this area of study. However, there is a need to make some modifications. In the introduction, it is recommended to formulate better, showing the importance that the interference of the weeds can cause in the peanut. In addition, to prepare a well-founded hypothesis, because in this article no hypothesis was presented. In this topic and throughout the text, the authors can explore the importance of A. Palmeri, since this plant has already been reported as resistant to some classes of herbicides. In the introduction, for the species Cucumis melo, if there are other products that control the cucumis plants, I think the authors should emphasize more on the importance of testing new herbicides. In methodology, I believe that the scientific part was not performed correctly. Example, the authors used only two lines and the borders? 3 replicates, low number for replicates in the experiment conducted at field level. It lacked to include analysis of growth and dry mass of the peanut, to prove that there was no effect of the herbicides. Data transformation, probably due to the high coefficient of variation. In the results and discussion, in this topic and in view of the great efficiency of Pyroxasulfone for A. palmeri, it is recommended to emphasize the use of this product as herbicide rotation, to be applied in areas with presence of resistant A. Palmeri and thus minimize new cases of resistance. In the text the authors compare the efficiency of the herbicides applied in other crops, without even being of the same family, which is not recommended. In conclusion, it is recommended to improve and speak only of the effect of the herbicides on the species studied, in the way presented it seems that the effect is for any species. In the item "References", it is recommended to check, since it is out of the rules.	L 23-31 L 65-68 Insert L 65-73 With limited space for experiment, sprayer boom is equipped to spray 2 rows, and uniform weed populations, the authors felt 3 replications were sufficient. Growers look at yield to determine the usefulness of a agricultural chemical, thus authors felt, along with visual evaluations, no other data was necessary. Very limited research is available on the use of pyroxasulfone in peanut; therefore, the need to refer to other crops. This is mentioned in previous discussion. Not sure what is meant here.
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	