

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_93967
Title of the Manuscript:	Genetic Insights for Nutritional Traits in Elite Rice (<i>Oryza sativa</i> L.) Crosses Using Generation Mean Analysis
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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The following suggestions are intended to help the author make this work more attractive to the reader.</p> <p>CRc1) The Abstract is too long and is written rather in the form of "Conclusions". A good Abstract must summarize the content of the work, providing the maximum of information, with the minimum of words, without going too much into technical details. Also, it must be written in a way that captures the reader's interest by providing an overview of the subject. It is therefore advisable to rewrite the abstract in a more concise and appealing way for the reader.</p> <p>CRc2) The "Conclusions" section is missing. The inclusion of this section is not a mere exercise, but it is essential to further attract the interest of the reader, particularly if there are perspectives of the work. It is advisable to insert a brief concluding section that reports any prospects to be implemented in future investigations.</p> <p>CRc3) The description of the statistical analysis is too fleeting and needs some clarification. In their statistics, the author used the means of three experimental values. This is a small number to perform statistics. In this case, it is necessary to specify the values of the relative standard deviation (RSD) coefficients as they measure the standard deviation or precision of the mean value (while the standard deviation coefficients show the closeness of the results to the mean values). Please, specify the values of the RSD in Tables 1, 2, and 3.</p> <p>CRc4) According to the latest data, the world's population currently amounts to 8 billion people. So, it is essential to reform rice to improve its nutritional value - as well as the quality of rice - without, however, provoking a significant decrease in its yield. To this end, a cross-combination of several rice varieties is currently under study in several Research Institutes. This work illustrates the results obtained well but, to make it more attractive, it is recommended to show the added value of the results obtained here by comparing them with other studies that have appeared in the literature on the action of genes in the control of effective traits in the quality of cooking rice. Note that the works cited in the <i>References</i> date, on average, 10 years or more (the most recent work is from 2017). Meanwhile, many works on this matter have appeared in literature even in very recent times (2022). This is the most vulnerable aspect of the present work.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>MRc1) The English of the manuscript should be revised; several typos were found.</p> <p>MRc2) The list of references is appropriate. However, the list of works cited in the "References" is not exhaustive. The author is recommended to complete this list taking into account the works on the subject that have recently appeared in the literature.</p> <p>MRc3) This investigation reports significant results. However, it is not sufficiently well-framed in works in the field that have recently appeared in the literature. In my opinion, a further effort in this sense is necessary.</p> <p>MRc4) Statistical analysis is not sufficiently well described and needs to be completed (see the above suggestions).</p>	
Optional/General comments	The work is interesting and shows relevant results. However, written in this form, it is unattractive and is likely to be ignored (and that would be a shame). The author is advised to take into account the suggestions expressed above.	

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:

Name:	Giorgio Sonnino
Department, University & Country	Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgium