

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_130664
Title of the Manuscript:	Response of varying seedling age, transplanting time and foliar supplements on growth and development of rice
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This study highlights the critical role of timely transplanting and appropriate foliar nutrition in optimizing rice growth and yield. The findings provide valuable insights for farmers to mitigate the negative impacts of delayed transplanting, improve resource use efficiency, and enhance rice productivity in regions facing challenges such as late monsoon onset. These strategies can contribute to increased food security and sustainable agricultural practices.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of the article is suitable	
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.	Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive. Add the metrics of the crop in the abstract and add the best treatment results in the abstract for easy access to the people who want to use the article	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct but needs to mention data values in the result part of the manuscript	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	I think adding some more references may support the manuscript much more and the references mentioned in the manuscript are too old. Add the references recent 5 years may be more prominent.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language and English quality are suitable for scholarly communications	
Optional/General comments	Add the points that are mentioned above to the manuscript PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT	

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:	Midde Sai Kumar
Department, University & Country	Mallareddy University, India