



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2015_AJEA_17209
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of Spray Tip and Spray Volume With Imazapic and Imazethapyr on Selected Weed Species
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	The manuscript covers useful issue, but, however, needs some corrections. The main subject of the research is "influence of spray tip and spray volume" but content of the article doesn't follow this problem sufficiently. In the section "Introduction", there is no mention about the importance of spray tip in herbicide efficacy. Moreover, results are mostly discussed with respect to imazapic and imazethapyr efficacy but not in the connection with spray tip and spray volume. Therefore, this section should be rewritten and authors should emphasis investigated parameters more than overall herbicide activity. I also suggest removing the division into particular weed species subsections and discussing it together. "Conclusion" seems to be like a discussion, so, it should to be displaced to subsections 3.1 and 3.2. This section should be an essence of investigated area and results. I don't understand what was the reason of different spray volume use in both experimental sites, in spray tips study. Similarly, why different tips were included to spray volume study. This variation can affect the results. This question should be explained.	Section added on spray tip. Spray volume and spray tip effect on herbicide efficacy is discussed in each subsection. None of the weeds mentioned, with the exception of <i>A. palmeri</i>, have been evaluated with different spray tip/volumes so it is only so much that can be said about these parameters. Disagree. I think it is easier to follow when divided into subsections. Disagree. Explanation was added to explain reasons for possible differences. Discussion was modified Since the same tips/volumes were used in each separate area for the two years this should not be an issue. If different tips/volumes were used in each year then there would be an issue.
Minor REVISION comments	Please, use only latin names of weed species, don't mix with English names. In the "Introduction" put a brief description (1-2 sentences) of tested herbicides. Why do you investigate them? I suppose that in the subsection 3.1.1, at the end of the first sentence it should be "less control than 94%" instead of 94 l/ha.	Corrected In 2006, imazethapyr and imazapic applications with all spray volumes controlled <i>U. texana</i> at least 94% and only applications with the spray volume of 47 L ha⁻¹ provided less control than the 94 L ha⁻¹ spray volume (Table 1).



SDI Review Form 1.6

	There are deficiencies in all tables: LSD (??? 0.01)	LSD (0.10)
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I propose to rewrite a title and my proposal is "Influence of Spray Tip and Spray Volume on the Efficacy of Imazapic and Imazethapyr Against Selected Weed Species" In "Materials and methods", in the subsection 2.2 the information about labour pressure of spraying should be given. With respect to subsection 2.3 my suggestion is to give all weed species in table including 1. Experimental site, 2. Weed species, 3. Particular weed species number, 4. Particular weed species growth stage (or size). The efficacy and comparison of examined herbicides is not the main subject of this study, therefore it is worth to consider removing these threads from the section "Results and discussion" (also tables 2 and 7).	Corrected Done Where there was a herbicide by year interaction those results are presented. Also, the same annual grasses were not present both years and <i>A. palmeri</i> was only present in south Texas in one of the years; therefore, each year is presented separately for annual grasses and <i>A. palmeri</i>.