

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_119983
Title of the Manuscript:	Review on Hormonal Regulation of Drought Stress Response in Plants
Type of the Article	Review Article

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

(<https://www.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	<i>I do agree with the reviewer comments and suggestions. I will try to make those changes as of which i consider necessary. Some suggestions like incorporation of figures and tables will make the manuscript lengthy and will exceed the word limit.)</i>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The article is a review work on the <i>Review on Hormonal Regulation of Drought Stress Response in Plants</i>. It contributes to an important aspect of soil and agricultural sciences. This review is important for the scientific community because it summarizes current knowledge on how plants use hormones to combat drought. This can provide a springboard for researchers to identify gaps and areas for future investigation. It offers insights into potential strategies for manipulating plant hormone levels to improve drought tolerance in crops. This could lead to the development of new plant varieties better suited to withstand drier conditions. It highlights the complex interplay between different plant hormones during drought stress. This knowledge can inform the design of more targeted approaches to enhance drought resistance. Overall, it is a promising article and may be accepted after the suggested changes have been implemented.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. Additional subsection titled Recommendations may be added in the manuscript.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient and recent.</p> <p><u>Additional Comments (Suggestions):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The keywords are generally written in alphabetical order. The author(s) may take note of it. A brief description of all figures and tables (with their numbers) should be written before the figures and tables in the paragraph preceding them. Figure 1 is not very clear. A better DPI figure must be added. More figures and tables must be added in the text to create interest among readers. The author(s) should add sections pertaining to recommendations after the conclusions section. 	<p>Noted</p> <p>Thanks</p> <p>OK</p> <p>Noted and effected</p>
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications. Although some minor spelling and formatting issues may be addressed before re-submission.</p>	<p>OK</p>
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

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)	