

Journal Name:	Journal of Global Ecology and Environment
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOGEE_12545
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECTS OF WATER DEFICITS ON RICE (<i>Oryza sativa</i>) CULTIVARS YIELD PERFORMANCE
Type of the 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>

PART 1: Review Comments

<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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></p>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The research is good, the methodology is great, but the writing is poor for this study. The author needs to work further in the writing before publishing this manuscript</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>		
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract is not comprehensive. Try combining the sentences and making it more professional. Use tools like Grammarly for writing cohesive sentences.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Appropriate</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>Not sound scientifically</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Not sufficient and not recent</p>	

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Not suitable	
Optional/General comments	Try reading more review articles for the drought stress and incorporate your research by solving those problem. The good one to read would be similar to these articles: 10.3389/fpls.2023.1215371 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e13744	

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:	Utsav Bhandari
Department, University & Country	Utah State University, USA