



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_48301
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficacy of 2,4-D Choline as Influenced by Weed Size in the Texas High Plains
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=sd-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In "Introduction" the authors describe Enlist™ as technology that utilizes cotton tolerance to 2,4-D choline, glyphosate, and glufosinate. However, investigated objects included also s-metolachlor and acetochlor that has not been mentioned in this section. Why did these ingredients were examined? Are they a part of Enlist™ technology? This question needs explanation. Crop data is essential point in field study, whereas in sec. "Material and methods" such information is missing. l. 71-72 - give an unit of weeds intensity Table 2. Dose units for some herbicides are incorrect. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The study investigated weed control in cotton field located in Texas High Plains. Therefore, I suggest to include this crop in the title of the manuscript. The title in present form is too general. Similarly, the name of the crop should also appear in the title of tables 3,4,5. l. 51-52 Why did the authors include year? Was it the first time when Enlist was applied in cotton? Table 1. It would be advantageous to give also weeds growth stages. Tables 3,4,5 – give an information that data represent % of control. 	
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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Renata Kieloch
Department, University & Country	Poland