

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_88520
Title of the Manuscript:	Hydroponics studies to screen the root characters of rice landraces ( <i>Oryza sativa</i> L.) under drought stress
Type of the Article	Original Research 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> )

### **PART 1:** Review Comments

	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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>Dear authors,</p> <p>Your current study “Hydroponics studies to screen the root characters of rice landraces (<i>Oryza sativa</i> L.) under drought stress” is of great importance in breeding for drought tolerance as it aimed to identify landraces and/or root traits that can be used to improve drought tolerance, especially at seedling growth stage, which help to make selection decision early in the breeding program. Furthermore, landraces are valuable genetic resource, which harbour several traits of interest in adaptation.</p> <p>In this study huge effort was deployed to screen several root traits under normal and water limited conditions. Therefore, the aim of study was appropriately addressed through the adopted methodology. Nevertheless, I must to highlight some points in order to make this research more precise, concise and relevant:</p> <p>First, huge effort should be addressed to correct the language of the manuscript, several redundancies was observed, spelling mistakes and unclear sentences as well. Therefore, I suggest to authors to send their manuscript to a native English speaker or to a researcher senior to help them to re-edit all the text in the more concise way.</p> <p>Second, the discussion part, appear very poor, although the high availability of researches on root topic, more discussion is required to improve the manuscript quality.</p> <p>I left comments, suggestions and questions on the manuscript that could help to improve these sections. So, please, try to take into account all these corrections during the revision.</p>	The manuscript corrections have been carried out.
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments		
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		

### **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)	No ethical issues.