

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_104668</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of varying irrigation regimes and cultivars on growth, yield, water use efficiency and economics of rice (<i>Oryza sativa</i>) under aerobic conditions</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>		
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	The authors must check the English writing in the whole manuscript. There are many mistake in typing, grammar, spelling words,...	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is prepared as a report than a scientific article. The reviewer has some specific comments as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Abstract: The content is too long. The content did not clarify the research methods and data. What is the practical significance of applying the research results?</li> <li>- Introduction: The content in the introduction overview does not present clear research gaps, why is this study needed? What methods are used in the research? What is the purpose of the study?</li> <li>- Materials and Methods: This content does not present and distinguish what is the data used in the study and which is the method used to evaluate?</li> <li>- The author did not clarify the purpose of the study, so the research method used was not clear. The research results are given making it difficult for the reader to imagine what the author wants to present in this study.</li> <li>- Conclusions: The conclusions presented are too sketchy to reflect the results of the study.</li> </ul>	

### 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:	Doan Quang Tri
Department, University & Country	Vietnam