



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART A:

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/AJEA/1611
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of the Efficacy of Different Rates of Herbicides on Weed Growth and Yield of Two Rice Varieties in Two Rice Ecologies in Sierra Leone.

(Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper)



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART B: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part and write here 'Corrected'/ if not agreed, give suitable justifications)
General comment:	Authors have tried to evaluate the dosage application of 2 herbicides and develop weed management strategies for two rice cultivars differing in their response to weeds/ herbicides. The presented work is worthy of publication; however, it requires certain change s before that.	corrected
Specific comments:	The work is of applied nature and of importance to scientists / farmers world over.	
Title and abstract	Please revise the abstract and shorten the sentences.	corrected
Introduction (Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?)	Yes, it is largely well-written with clear objectives / rationale	
Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?	I have certain concerns regarding citations; Authors have not cited enough / pertinent references in relation to their work. In fact, they have cited only 8 papers. Authors must check the literature, try to present a good rationale for the present work, correlate their work /finding with those available in the literature.	corrected
Materials & methods (Kindly comment on the suitability of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods should be provided to allow peers to evaluate and/or replicate the work)	Need revision. Please provide citations. PI provide information about the soil type; irrigation frequency / regime,	Corrected. Rainfed.
Results & discussion (Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant references during discussion. 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out. 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?)	Data is OK, worth presenting and sharing with others in the field. References are largely lacking / missing Discussion and conclusions are based upon the finding; yet, the concern is about the discussion with already known findings / results. Statistical analyses is not good; requires improvement.	corrected
Are there any ethical or competing interest issues?	No	
Conclusion (Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not be biased and should be based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only)	Yes, it is supported by results.	
References	Please include recent and relevant reference that have relevance to the findings of the study	corrected