

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_117013
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of irrigation regimes and nitrogen levels on physiological growth parameters of ryegrass
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	The present manuscript topic is investigated in the literature, and there is a very few of reference published. However, this paper gives significant contribution to the current knowledge in related field. The data are sound, and it deserves to be published, after minor revisions.	
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Effect of irrigation regimes and applied nitrogen levels on growth and physiological responses of ryegrass	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	Abstract: Abstract is not written as per Journal Format. Problem statement is missing/not well-defined. Please add problem/importance statement for present research work. An abstract should be concise (≤ 250 words) self-contained summary, should include the background/ objective, purpose of the study (including its statistical significance), methods, results and conclusion in one paragraph. Need improvements.	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Introduction: Authors completely failed to develop the hypothesis with reference to title and objective, in the introduction section. Use www.turnitin.com to find and eliminate unnecessary self-repetition and any copied text. Don't use introduction as second window of review of literature. Run spell check and proof the manuscript to avoid spelling mistakes and grammatical errors. Materials and methods: The text has many typing and grammatical errors, capitalization issues. All proper nouns must be abbreviated. Abbreviations must be described completely at first mention with brackets. Don't start a sentence with an abbreviation here. Please add details for analytical methodologies to make it reproducible. Quality assurance of data is mandatory!!! How many batch, repeats, chemical grade and for used instruments manufacturers' user manual and instructions were strictly followed or not! Add suitable published reference for statistical software used. Results and Discussion Data is sound one. It deserves to be published. In statistics, the analytical test calculates the smallest significant between two means as if a test had been run on those two means (as opposed to all of the groups together). This enables	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>the research scientists to make direct comparisons between two means from two individual groups. Any difference larger than the analytical test value is considered as a significant result. In mean tables, when the main effects as well as their interactions are found significant then interactions should be discussed. However, when main effects are significant and interactions are found non-significant, then main effects should be discussed only.</p> <p>Discussion needs improvements. Please cite Figure No. or Table No. in brackets at suitable places for a better connectivity in results and discussion sections as to facilitate the reader. I would have expected slightly greater discussion; more detail on the mechanisms and logical reasoning is required. There is much more scope here for discussing the implications of what the results means. Add suitable references throughout discussion section, where required.</p> <p>Conclusion: Kindly revise the conclusion subjected to conclusive findings only.</p>	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	<p>Carefully revise Title of manuscript.</p> <p>Very Minute Scientific Discussion.</p> <p>Please improve the figures/graphs with legends. Also mention number of replicates in a mean i.e, n = ?? in each figure legend.</p> <p>The tables must be as per Journal format.</p> <p>It has been shown that the manuscript is submitted in speedy way, without reading the instructions completely.</p> <p>Discussion need improvement.</p>	
6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have	<p>References: A few very old references have been used. These must be updated with recent research findings or removed. Proper formatting is questionable. It must be according to Soil & Environment Journal. References formatting are inconsistent. Verify each reference from original source and cross check references in the text and reference section.</p>	
7. suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	<p>Keywords are not appropriate. Keywords should be words not contained in the title or in the abstract. Their usefulness is to make easier the searching of the article using the common scientific search engines. Since several keywords are already present in the title, and/or repeated several times in the abstract, I strongly advise the authors to replace some of them and add more.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	Final Decision: Minor Revision.	
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<p>English style and language require a profound revision. However, the readability of the manuscript needs to be improved, preferably carefully reviewing by a native English speaker.</p>	
Optional / General comments	<p>Prepare response letter with point-to-point replies to each comment. Accept addition or deletion using track changes option of MS Word (attached). Don't forget to highlight changes you want to made in the current version (attached).</p> <p>Accept after incorporation of minor revisions suggested by reviewer.</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:	Tayyaba Naz
Department, University & Country	Institute of Soil and Environmental Sciences, University of Agriculture Faisalabad, Pakistan