

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | International Journal of Plant & Soil Science |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_IJPSS_114021 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Effect of microclimate modification on growth and yield of basmati rice under Punjab conditions |
| Type of the Article | |

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><u>Compulsory</u> 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> | <p>Strengths:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Location and Timeline: The field experiments were conducted at the Research Farm, Department of Climate Change and Agricultural Meteorology, Punjab Agricultural University, during kharif 2018. This detailed information provides context and allows for the reproducibility of the study. 2. Variety and Transplanting Dates: The use of Pusa Basmati variety and the consideration of two different transplanting dates contribute to the diversity of the study. This allows for the assessment of crop response under varied conditions. 3. Factorial Experimental Design: The adoption of a Factorial Randomized Complete Block Design with four replications enhances the robustness of the experimental setup. This design enables the evaluation of multiple factors simultaneously, improving the validity of the findings. 4. Use of Advanced Instruments: The Line Quantum Sensor and Sun Scan Canopy Analyzer were employed to measure diurnal cycles of photosynthetically active radiation (PAR) and green leaf area, respectively. These instruments enhance the precision and reliability of the data collected. 5. Statistical Analysis: The utilization of CPCS-1 software for statistical analysis demonstrates a systematic approach to data interpretation, ensuring accuracy in drawing conclusions. <p>Areas for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Detailed Methodology: While the general experimental setup is explained, providing a more detailed methodology, including specific procedures for data collection and instrument usage, would enhance the clarity of the study. 2. PAR Calculation Clarification: The formula for calculating the percentage of PAR interception is provided, but a brief explanation or example would aid in better understanding, especially for readers less familiar with the specific calculation. 3. Correlation Analysis: The nature of the correlation coefficients and the significance levels are not mentioned. Including this information would strengthen the interpretation of the relationships between periodic tillers and environmental factors. 4. Visual Representation: Incorporating graphs or figures to represent the diurnal cycles of PAR, green leaf area, and correlations would facilitate a clearer understanding of the trends and relationships. 5. Conclusion or Implications: A brief conclusion or discussion of the practical implications of the findings would add value and context to the study. <p>In summary, the study demonstrates strong experimental design, instrument utilization, and statistical analysis. Providing more detailed methodology, clarifying calculations, presenting correlation analysis results, incorporating visual aids, and concluding with practical implications would further enhance the study's comprehensibility and impact.</p> | |
| <p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | | |
| <p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p> | | |

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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: | Dustin Tahisin Gómez Rodríguez |
| Department, University & Country | Corporación Universitaria De Asturias, Colombia |