



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012 AJEA 2791
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of the relative weed competitiveness of some lowland rice varieties in Sierra Leone.

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	This is a very good study that can help African farmers with the drudgery of weed management in lowland rice. However, the Authors need to attend to some issues in the paper in order to make it better. The Authors are referred to the text for the comments and observations raised by the reviewer. The objective is the work was not achieved since the weed competitiveness of the rice varieties are not known. Which rice varieties were more weed competitive than others? This is what the paper tried to address.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The authors must make a clear understanding of the experimental design used in the study as there is no such experimental design as mentioned. It is more of 6 x 2 factorial arranged in RCBD. No reference was made to weed biomass in Table 1 in the presentation of results and the discussion and should be removed if it is not of any value to the researchers. However, since it is of great value it must be put to use. It is insufficient to indicate that there were significant differences between the rice varieties (Table 2) without showing the ranking to indicate which ones were statistically different. Also, it is	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	grossly inadequate to show that there was an interaction (S x V) (Table 2) without expressing it. This implies that a lot of information are hidden in the work which can make the work richer if brought out.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper needs to be improved upon as indicated in many areas in the text in terms of grammar, consistency in writing and referencing.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Musa Gimba Matthew KOLO
Department, University & Country	Department of Crop Production, Federal University of Technology, Minna, Nigeria