



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_14513
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Integrated Weed Management Practices on Weeds Infestation, Yield Components and Yield of Cowpea [Vigna unguiculata(L.) Walp.] in eastern Wollo, Ethiopia
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Suggested new title: Effect of Integrated Weed Management Practices on Yield of Cowpea [Vigna unguiculata (L.) Walp.] in eastern Wollo, Ethiopia Northern Ethiopia??? Authors should correct the spelling of names of species (ex. - Wrong - correct Vignaunguiculata. - Vigna unguiculata). correct throughout the text. In Abstract: The aim of the present work more clearly in the text: The objective was to evaluate the efficiency of the integration of chemical and manual control in the management of weeds in cowpea. Methodology: The authors should present experimental design which was used in the study. Describe in detail all the treatments. 20 dae? Is 20 days after emergence (DAE)? Results: Cite the main purpose of integrating control methods on weed management and selectivity for culture. Which treatment showed better cost / benefit?	The title of this experiment is commented and revised or suggested by advisory board which is not subjected to change. The title of the experiment is expressive. Disagreed with this suggested title. The objectives were to assess the effect of preemergence s-metolachlor and pendimethalin on weeds, and growth, yield components and yield of cowpea and to investigate the possibilities of supplementing low doses of herbicides with hand weeding for effective and cost effective weed management which is clearly stated in the abstract part. See the methodology part Yes



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Conclusions: Rewrite the conclusions. The conclusions should answer the hypotheses and objectives of the study. Obs. Part of the text is in green color. 1. INTRODUCTION The authors present two forms in text citation, by the number and names of the authors. Correct according to the standards of the journal. In the text not the hypotheses of the study was described. Rewrite the research objectives as suggestions in the abstract. 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS The description of the methodology is incomprehensible. Authors should improve the writing of the text. In research should use spray equipment to keep the pressure constant work. Which was the pressure used to ensure the volume of 450L / ha? what kind of spray tip was used? what was the time and the weather conditions at the time of application of herbicides? the ground was wet? Authors should describe in detail the methodology for each assessment performed at work, with dates and units of parameters is evaluated. This facilitates the understanding of the discussion of the results. For the cost analysis, it should be highlighted in the text reference values (US \$) used in the calculations. And describe in detail which calculations were made to compare the treatments. We suggest that analysis of data is performed by the Scott-Knott test (grouping) or Contrast (chemical - chemical, chemical -	It is corrected based on SDI format Correct and expressive Using flat-fan nozzle. Yes it is wet.
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	manual and integrated - chemical; integrated-manual, always with the control plots). Consult a statistician area. Why was not compared the locations of the experiments – Sirinka and Jari? As the authors presented a discussion of the results for items (parameters or evaluation), the same should be included in the methodology accordingly. 3. RESULTS& DISCUSSION The text in the discussion of the data is incomprehensible. Authors should rewrite obeying the rules of scientific writing. Rewrite discuss the results after corrections of static analyzes of the data and request corrections. Display tables on the same page. Algunas tables can be excluded from work. Obey the sequence of the evaluated parameters presented in the methodology described in the discussion of results. 4. CONCLUSIONS Rewrite the conclusions. The conclusions should answer the hypotheses and objectives of the study.	Not clear First each parameters are analysed separately both in the locations and then we compare each parameter for homogeneity test, then if it is homogeneous we go through combined analysis.so it is clearly expressed and compared based on homogeneity test and combined analysis.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		Generally the reviewer has seen the paper roughly. Lack of critical reading.