

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_IJPSS_118001
Title of the Manuscript:	GENETIC VARIABILITY, CORRELATION AND PATH ANALYSIS STUDIES IN EARLY TRANSPLANTED RICE
Type of the Article	

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1- R/ THIS MANUSCRIPT IS VERY IMPORTANT TO THE SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY BECAUSE IT DEALS WITH RICE PRODUCTION. THIS PRODUCT IS IN WIDE DEMAND WORLDWIDE AND ALL RESEARCH THAT DEALS WITH ITS PRODUCTION, PEST CONTROL, ETC, WILL BE OF MUCH IMPORTANCE.</p> <p>2- R/ THE TITLE IS APPROPRIATE AND AGREE WITH THE TYPE OF RESEARCH AND THE OBJECTIVES OF THE RESEARCHERS. THERE ARE OTHER STUDIES ON THE TOPIC AT WORLDWIDE</p> <p>3- R/ THE SUMMARY IS WELL PREPARED AND FOLLOWS THE JOURNAL'S GUIDELINES. I CONSIDER THAT THE ABSTRACT COMPLIES WITH ALL THE RESEARCH ITEMS.</p> <p>4- R/ THIS MANUSCRIPT IS VERY WELL STRUCTURED AND FOLLOWS ALL THE JOURNAL GUIDELINES. IT WAS SUBDIVIDED BY SUB-SECTIONS. ALL ITEMS IN THE MANUSCRIPT WERE WELL PLACED, EX. TABLES, REFERENCES.</p> <p>5- R/ THIS MANUSCRIPT IS VERY WELL WRITTEN AND I CONSIDER IT TO BE SCIENTIFICALLY CORRECT. COMPLY WITH ALL JOURNAL GUIDELINES.</p> <p>6- THE REFERENCES WERE 17 IN THE TEXT AND IN THE FINAL LIST. ALL REFRENCIES WERE WELL PLACED IN THE TEXT AND IN THE FINAL LIST. 11 OF THE 17 REFERENCES ARE UPDATED. THERE ARE ANOTHER 6 REFERENCES SOMETHING DELAYED IN THE PUBLICATION TIME. EX. 1935, 1953, 1955, 1959, 1961, AND 1981. AUTHORS SHOULD ANALYZE THESE REFERENCES AND SEE WHETHER THEY CAN BE UPDATED OR NOT.</p> <p>7- R/ IN MY UNDERSTANDING, THIS IS A VERY WELL PREPARED MANUSCRIPT AND COMPLIANT WITH THE JOURNAL'S GUIDELINES. ALL THE ITEMS WERE WELL INTRODUCED AND THERE ARE NO EXCEPTIONS FOR THE SCIENTIFIC NAMES OF THE SPECIES UNDER STUDY, WHICH WERE WRITTEN WRONG, WHICH CAN BE CORRECTED WITHOUT MAJOR PROBLEMS.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>R/ THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE USED IN WRITING THIS MANUSCRIPT IS ADEQUATE AND ALLOWS SCIENTIFIC COMMUNICATION WITH THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

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:	Anselmo Enrique Ferrer Hernandez
Department, University & Country	Havana University, Cuba