

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ IJPSS _120535
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Drought Stress of Two Genotypes of Sorghum (Sorghun bicolor L.) Using Physiological Parameters
Type of the Article	

[Review Form 3](#)

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript presents significant findings that advance our understanding of Assessment of Drought Stress of Two Genotypes of Sorghum (<i>Sorghum bicolor</i>L). The rigorous methodology and comprehensive analysis contribute valuable insights to the field, making it a noteworthy addition to the scientific literature. I appreciate the authors' clear presentation of their results and the implications for future research. However, I believe that further discussion on Stress of Two Genotypes of Sorghum could enhance the manuscript's impact even more. Overall, this work is a commendable effort that will likely stimulate further investigation and dialogue within the scientific community.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of the article is generally suitable as it reflects the main focus of the research. However, it could be more descriptive to better capture the specific findings or implications of the study. I suggest an alternative title: “[Alternative Title Reflecting Key Findings or Focus]” to enhance clarity and appeal.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract provides a good overview of the study but could benefit from some enhancements. Here are my suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Add Key Results: Including specific findings will give readers a clearer picture of the study's impact. 2. Clarify Objectives: Ensure the primary aim of the research is explicitly stated to highlight its significance. 3. Methodology Brief: A concise mention of the methodology can provide context for the results. 4. Implications: Adding a sentence on the implications of the findings would strengthen the abstract's relevance. <p>Incorporating these elements will make the abstract more comprehensive and informative.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate. The organization follows a logical flow, guiding the reader through the introduction, methods, results, and discussion effectively. However, consider the following suggestions for improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clear Subheadings: Ensure that all subsections have clear and descriptive headings to enhance navigation. 2. Consistency: Maintain consistent formatting throughout the manuscript for headings and subheadings. 3. Balanced Length: Ensure that each section is proportionate in length, avoiding overly lengthy methods or discussion that may overshadow other sections. <p>Overall, the structure supports clarity and comprehension, but slight adjustments could enhance its effectiveness.</p>	
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound?</p>	<p>The manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness through its rigorous methodology and thorough data analysis. The authors employ appropriate experimental techniques and statistical methods that align with established standards in the field. Additionally, the</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>results are presented clearly, with sufficient detail to support the conclusions drawn. Overall, the careful attention to detail and adherence to scientific principles contribute to the technical soundness of the work, making it a valuable contribution to the literature.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. :</p>	<p>The references cited in the manuscript are generally sufficient and encompass key studies relevant to the topic. However, to strengthen the literature review, I recommend including some recent studies from the past few years that may provide additional insights or support for the findings. Specifically, references that address emerging trends or recent advancements in the field would enhance the manuscript's depth. Including a mix of foundational and contemporary works will ensure a comprehensive understanding of the subject matter.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication. However, there are areas that could benefit from clarification and refinement. Some sentences could be rephrased for improved readability, and occasional grammatical errors or awkward phrasing should be addressed. Overall, with minor revisions, the manuscript can achieve a more polished and professional tone.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Here are some general comments for the manuscript:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clarity and Readability: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ensure that the language used is clear and concise. Avoid overly complex sentences and jargon that may confuse readers. ○ Use subheadings to break down sections and improve readability. 2. Introduction: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The introduction should clearly state the research question or hypothesis. It should also provide a brief overview of the background and significance of the study. 3. Literature Review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ensure the literature review is comprehensive and includes recent studies relevant to the topic. ○ Highlight any gaps in the existing literature that your research aims to fill. 4. Methodology: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide a detailed explanation of the methods used in the research. This should include information on data collection, sample size, and analytical techniques. ○ Justify the choice of methods and discuss any limitations. 5. Results: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Present results clearly, using tables and figures where appropriate. Ensure all figures and tables are labeled and referenced in the text. ○ Discuss the significance of the results in relation to the research question. 	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<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 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Fatema Tuz Zohora Toma
Department, University & Country	Bangladesh