

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_IJPSS_117772
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimizing Rice Yields: A Mahbubnagar Perspective
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>)

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The manuscript is very crucial for the scientific community as it focuses on optimizing rice yields. It highlights the importance of closing yield gaps for food security, providing insights for informed decision-making and interventions in Mahbubnagar and similar regions, stressing the ongoing need for targeted interventions and improved farming practices.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The abstract is comprehensive, though it didn't capture recommendations based on the findings of the article.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The references are recent. However, most of names cited in the work are not in the reference list and majority of names in the reference list are not cited in the body of the paper.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, though the researcher should thoroughly go through the manuscript and correct various grammatical, writing, spellings, and punctuation errors.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript did not make any recommendations.</p> <p>Corrections should be done on the references</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:	Kalu Udo Emeruche
Department, University & Country	Michael Okpara University of Agriculture, Nigeria