

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_122697</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of Soluble Silica On Plant Stress: An Experimental Study</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>The article holds scientific and statistical significance as it talks about the solutions on the new and big problem of plant fertility and growth yield. This is a problem faced by farmers in a large number and affects agriculture production. The scientific community including agriculture science community would like this severe problem to be solved as early as possible. This paper seems to be of importance and significance to the scientific community.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>The title is to be more elaborate as it seems a little too generic, like "An Experimental study of Mung Beans to perceive the effects of Soluble Silica on Plant Stress" It would give the reader more information about what they are reading.</p>	
<p><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b></p>	<p>The abstract could be little more detailed and some facts and experimental data could be added to it as well as at-least 5-6 keywords. It would enhance the quality.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>The 'computers for research in plant growth' section should be brief as no experiments were done in this specific domain and the information about of this processes is well known is the field of the work. The 'plant stress' section could be explained more, as how it integrates to the experiments given in this manuscript. The pictorial representations of graphs and charts could enhance the quality of the manuscript. The output data and its analysis with 'results and discussion could be added' to enhance the quality. The methodology and data extraction of the experiment is bit unclear and could be explained and integrated more to the manuscript to make a coherent and rich read even for the general audience. Conclusion could be followed by recommendation as a research outcome a stand could be taken as what to do next or how the research findings could enhance the growth/ yield of the crop. As this is an experiment the measurable data figure in the conclusion could be given, with out it, it seems an incomplete message and seems a descriptive study rather than an experimental study. The bio chemical growth or other growth factors are not explained properly as why we should be worried about it and how the study is relevant to the factors. The title of the sections are recommended not to be a question as it is not a book but an article. So the 'What is plant stress?' and other questions could be used as heading but not a question like 'Plant Stress' etc. More explanations like why the experiment subject is taken as the Mung Been to be done with reference. Minor formatting mistakes have been noted as in 'biochemical growth parameters measured' the 't' of the content is missing. Upper case and lower case mistakes as well as superscript and sub script in different sections are not done properly like 'SiO<sub>2</sub>' etc.</p>	
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>The script is on experimental work done on reducing plant stress and though there are several problems in the script it could be corrected as long as it is based on scientific experiments. Though the data is missing in this script. Technically without any further rectification, the work seems to be more descriptive than experimental.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> :</p>	<p>Though the references seems recent (most recent 2024) and adequate in quality and quantity the referencing in the manuscript body seemed off and the formatting of those references are not proper as in reference section after 13<sup>th</sup> reference the 14<sup>th</sup> reference is formatted like 14. not [14]. and at last reference is empty with number 54. Not all given references are referenced in manuscript body from 14<sup>th</sup> to 20<sup>th</sup>. The reference to be followed as per previously published papers.</p>	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language used here is scholarly enough but could be better. Minor revision to the language could be done as some lines seems in casual format.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<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:	<b>Subhajit Pal</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Maulana Abul Kalam Azad University of Technology, India</b>