

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_104640
Title of the Manuscript:	Enhancing Yield Potential of Rice using Nutrients and Plant Growth Regulators
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:

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

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory 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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript is of great importance to the scientific community because its study was conducted to find the best plant growth regulator for two common rice crops grown in India. This finding can be learned and applied in other countries, too. 2. The title of the manuscript should be modified to suit the objectives and the methodology adopted. It can be seen that many parameters were measured, analyzed, and compared between the five regulator treatments and the two rice varieties. Thus, the title should not only focus on the yield potential, but also on growth as well. Therefore, the title should be like this: Enhancing Growth and Yield Potential of Rice Using Nutrients and Plant Growth Regulators. Another option is "Effects of Different Nutrients and Plant Growth Regulators on the Growth and Yield of Two Rice Varieties." This is just a suggestion, but the reality is up to the consideration of the authors. However, what 3. The abstract is comprehensive, but some corrections and explanations are needed such as using English words for the season rather than a local language and correcting English. 4. The manuscript contains all the components of a typical paper, and all parts are written and explained reasonably, with citations and references properly given. However, there is some missing information that should be properly addressed. Detailed comments are shown below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The manuscript does not have the layout of the experimental design, so it is recommended to have one, which can add the meaning to manuscript. - The factorial randomized block design (FRBD) was used, so it is suggested the author mentions the right design: is it a two-factor design or what? Then, the right statistical test should be mentioned. For example, "the two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to compare means between the five treatments and the two rice varieties at the 5% significance level." However, such information was not mentioned in the method. - Each parameter measured in the study was not explained, so the processing of measuring each sample should be precisely and clearly stated in the method. Then, repeated studies can be done by other researchers who wish to follow this study. In short, it is suggested that the author addresses these comments properly. - In the result section, the findings were given and described, but some did not mention the corresponding figures or tables of the results. - The figure and tables are placed even below the reference list. If this is not in line with the journal guidelines, please consider moving them to the result second instead. 5. Yes, it is. 6. Yes, there are many references and the corresponding citations in the text match the number of the references. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Yes, the English quality of this manuscript is very acceptable, but some corrections are needed to ensure the right English writing.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript should be considered for publication, but what should be done next is ensure that the author has to address and respond to the comments properly and with care.</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:	Lyhour Hin
Department, University & Country	Royal University of Agriculture, Cambodia