|  |
| --- |
|  |
| Journal Name: | [**Journal of Scientific Research and Reports**](https://journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR) |
| Manuscript Number: | **Ms\_JSRR\_134336** |
| Title of the Manuscript:  | **Effect of Direct Seeded Rice (DSR) on Different Rice Cultivars in the Foothills of Siruvani** |
| Type of the Article | **Research article** |

|  |
| --- |
| PART 1: Comments |
|  | Reviewer’s comment**Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | Author’s Feedback *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **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.** | The experiment conducted by the author on title “Effect of Direct Seeded Rice (DSR) on Different Rice Cultivars in the Foothills of Siruvani” is quite relevant to present scenario of rice production in country considering heavy losses in yield and economics under TPR , however the author should have written more about the challenges encountered for rice production in the region where the experiment was conducted.  |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?****(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | **The title of the research paper is quite understandable but it can be slightly improved as below for more scientific precision, clarity, and grammatically accuracy:****“Performance of Different Rice Cultivars under Direct Seeded Rice (DSR) in the Foothills of Siruvani”** |  |
| 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. | The objective, methodology and the results of the experiment are clearly mentioned in the ABSTRACT. Besides, the location, season of conducting experiment and experimental design followed is well described. However there are certain grammatical and sentence formation discrepancies which have been mentioned in comment box of the manuscript. |  |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | The manuscript having ABSTRACT, Introduction, materials and Methods as well as reference section was revied thoroughly . the article is written scientifically , however the structure of table 2 and 3 needs modification in the style of journal. More suggestions have been mentioned in the comment box of the manuscript which need to be looked into it and necessary correction are required . |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | The references mentione in the text are sufficient and they have been documented in the REFERENCE section very well however there is one reference of Kumar et al (2022) mentioned in Text but under reference section it shows (2021). This need to be corrected. |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Yes, the English quality used in the manuscript is quite satisfactory, however, at one or two places it has been suggested to modify.  |  |
| Optional/General comments | **In general the manuscript require thorough revision. Based on comments mentioned in comment box. The experiment was conducted for one year hence nothing concrete be concluded unless it is repeated for more than one year.**  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **PART 2:**  |
|  | **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)* |
| **Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?**  | *(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* |  |

**Reviewer details:**

**R. R. Upasani, Birsa Agricultural University, India**