

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.	Very late planting of aged seedling in rice suffered from yield loss and affect the production so it is must for scientists to fix the proper time of transplanting with young seedling to improve in crop yield and remuneration.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No Because only growth data included, not any development data	
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	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	on the basis of only growth data there is no more value of this manuscript	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Few missing in reference..add it	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Poorly written. So many poorly written sentences correct it.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	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:	Prakashchandra N. Parmar
Department, University & Country	Navsari Agricultural University, India