

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_IJPSS_117718
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimizing Growth and Yield in Aerobic Rice through IoT-based Drip Irrigation and Fertigation
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>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>Traditionally, rice cultivation has been associated with flooded fields, known as paddies, which are water-intensive and often environmentally unsustainable. Recent years have seen a growing shift towards more sustainable and water-efficient rice cultivation methods, with aerobic rice emerging as a promising alternative. Aerobic rice is grown under flood-free conditions, conserving water resources while offering the potential for increased yield and improved resource management. By continuously monitoring and adjusting irrigation and fertilization parameters, farmers can maximize yields while conserving water and minimizing environmental impacts. In this aspect, the topic of the present study is relevant.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The abstract is written as an abbreviated version of the manuscript. In my opinion, it should be revised editorially by removing the first 3 chapters and the last one. The abstract does not need to have the names of the individual chapters. The proposed size is very large. The editor probably has word count requirements. I suggest no more than 300 words.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>I believe that the quality of the manuscript will improve if the authors consider the following recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The keyword "sensor" is not selected appropriately as it occurs only once in the main text 2. The second sentence describing the purpose needs to be edited to drop the details. 3. Perhaps where DAS is written, DASM is not meant!? 4. It would be good to write down how the values of "Harvest index" and "Economic yield " are calculated, regardless of the literature cited. 5. specifying the dimensions in the individual sub-points is redundant. These are headings and it is not appropriate to write dimensions in them. 6. What is meant „Test weight“? 7. The interpretation of the Harvest index (fig.1) with a straight line between the individual variants of the attempts is incorrect. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>I can't comment on the quality of the English language</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:	Georgi Kostadinov
Department, University & Country	Institute of Soil Science, Agrotechnologies and Plant Protection "Nikola Pushkarov", Bulgaria