

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_110350
Title of the Manuscript:	Standardisation of Temperature Induction Response Technique: A Promising Method for Screening of Maize Genotypes for Thermotolerance at Seed Level
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript is to carry important qualifications for scientific community.</p> <p>2. Article title is suitable this compilation article.</p> <p>3. Abstract General information has a large place in the abstract. The purpose of the research should be explained more clearly. Only suggestions are made in the abstract. The result of the research is not mentioned. The result of the research should be mentioned in a few lines. Giving information about the content of the article is important for the readability of the article.</p> <p>4. Subsections and structure of the manuscript In the conclusion section of the article, table values should be explained and interpreted in one or two sentences. There is a lack of resources in the discussion section. The result of the research should be explained in more detail and discussed with more sources. The conclusion of the article is not mentioned in the discussion. The effect of the work done can be discussed in more detail in a wide range.</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? The scientific formal format of the article is correct. However, there are deficiencies and sections that need to be corrected in the spelling and content format of the article. The sections that need to be corrected and worked on are explained in detail in the previous articles and marked on the article.</p> <p>6. References References are insufficient in the discussion section of the article. This section needs to be supported with more references.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. The grammar of the article is appropriate.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	No	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hatice Çobanoğlu
Department, University & Country	Düzce University, Türkiye