

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_97403
Title of the Manuscript:	Screening of Phenoxyacetic Acid Derivatives In Rainfed Rice
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.journalarja.com/index.php/ARJA/editorial-policy>)

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 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. Yes, any advance in the agricultural field or relevant cultures like rice through scientific research is important. 2. I suggest: Screening of the effect of Phenoxyacetic Acid Derivatives In Rainfed Rice, because you are not detected phenoxyacetic acids but evaluated them on rice 3. It is a bit hard to keep the thread because the many abbreviations without read the text yet. You could just refer to the highest (and lowest) value for every variety and variable, and say briefly some about methodology and conclusion 4. Yes, it has a clear structure 5. Yes 6. Yes, but keep the same format	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. Very good quality	
Optional/General comments	Just some few corrections (punctuation)	

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:	Paola Andrea Murillo Gómez
Department, University & Country	Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Colombia