

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_102776
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative analysis of traditional scented rice (<i>Oryza sativa</i> L.) varieties under organic cultivation based on DUS testing and yield assessment
Type of the Article	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:

(<https://www.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The manuscript contributes essential new knowledge and findings to the scientific community, agricultural sector, and related agencies.</p> <p>The title of the manuscript is suitable.</p> <p>The Abstract of the article requires revision. The comments are listed in the Optional/General Comments section.</p> <p>The sequence and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>The references are sufficient and recent.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The English language of the article requires minor editing as there are some grammatical and spelling mistakes.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p> <p>Abstract:</p> <p>Introduction:</p> <p>Materials and Methods:</p> <p>Results and Discussion:</p> <p>Conclusion:</p>	<p>The Abstract section is not comprehensive and requires revisions. The authors are required to provide a brief background of the study and problem statement. Authors should also include more detailed elaboration of the Methodology section especially on the field cultivation using organic approach, how the yield was assessed, and variables evaluated by the DUS approach. The authors should also highlight several significant findings and draw a clear conclusion at the end of the Abstract.</p> <p>The authors had provided a clear background of study, problem statement, and objective in the Introduction section.</p> <p>The authors should provide more elaboration on the rice plot setup (such as total number of plots constructed, number of blockings, the way vermicompost and green manure were applied (surface application?), the period of cultivation from start until the end and daily maintenance, at which day the paddy were assessed using DUS and other variables, the exact day the paddy were harvested and how did you harvest etc).</p> <p>The findings of the research were well elaborated and discussed.</p> <p>Suggest providing suggestion for future research at the end of the Conclusion section.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ch'ng Huck Ywih
Department, University & Country	Universiti Malaysia Kelantan, Malaysia