

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_121352
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Heat Stress during reproductive stage on plant growth, total biomass production and their Correlation with Grain yield in Rice
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>Different genotypes of wheat were compared with a single genotype that is inferior to the tested genotypes in several parameters. Unfortunately, the manuscript does not introduce an appropriate genotype as a significant finding; if no suitable genotype exists, this has not been adequately discussed. The discussion section is poorly written and fails to provide meaningful scientific commentary. Additionally, the review of sources is weak, superficial, and rudimentary.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Suitable title: Impact of Heat Stress on Growth, Biomass, and Grain Yield in Rice During Reproductive Stage</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract is very poorly and incompletely written. It is not clear how it works. The scientific achievement of the research is not written in it.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>No,</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The methods employed do not have a solid scientific basis. Overall, the manuscript does not present any relevant scientific achievements (there may be valuable findings in the original research, but they are not addressed here). The discussion section is poorly written and fails to provide meaningful scientific commentary. Additionally, the review of sources is weak, superficial, and rudimentary.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>No, more sources need to be studied.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No,</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The results of the review of this manuscript:</p> <p>This manuscript has been thoroughly reviewed. While it is evident that significant time and effort were devoted to conducting this research, the value of publishing scientific articles necessitates the following observations:</p> <p>Necessary comments were inserted until the first part of the results. However, after a complete review of the materials and methods, as well as the results section, it became clear that this manuscript lacks a proper scientific framework. The methods employed do not have a solid scientific basis. Different genotypes of wheat were compared with a single genotype that is inferior to the tested genotypes in several parameters. The discussion section is poorly written and fails to provide meaningful scientific commentary. Additionally, the review of sources is weak, superficial, and rudimentary.</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	Aiuob Moradi
Department, University & Country	University of Kurdistan & Science and Technology Park of Kurdistan, Iran