

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_116745</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Genetic evaluation of advanced breeding lines of rice (Oryza sativa L.) for grain yield and nutrient characters in upland condition</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Research Article</b>

### **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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy> )

**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><b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>1- <b>Yes it can be important if it includes new analysis methods and new results</b></p> <p>2- <b>Yes</b></p> <p>3- <b>No</b> , There is no information about how the experiment was performed (experimental design, cropping years, repeats, reference cultivars,...), in the abstract section.</p> <p>4- <b>No</b></p> <p>5- <b>It is very week.</b></p> <p>6- <b>Many important sentences do not have any reference.</b></p>	
<p><b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>No, The writing of the hole manuscript is very poor and suffers from many literary errors.</p>	
<p><b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments</p>	<p>The units in the entire manuscript should be the same according to the format of the journal.</p> <p>The writing of the hole manuscript is very poor and suffers from many literary errors.</p> <p>Statistical analysis is weak, inadequate and unprofessional. Specialized statistical analysis to evaluate the genetic diversity in assessed genotypes seems necessary to improve the article.</p> <p>There is no information about how the experiment was performed (experimental design, cropping years, repeats, reference cultivars,...), in the abstract section.</p> <p>The units in the entire manuscript should be the same according to the format of the journal.</p> <p>The article in its current state does not seem acceptable in terms of the quality of writing and statistical analysis.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Shakiba Shahmoradi
Department, University & Country	Iran