

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_93523
Title of the Manuscript:	Cytological Study of Anthers for Pollen sterility in the F7 Generation of a Rice (Oryza Sativa L.) Cross
Type of the 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Title: Title does not match with the work carried out. It may be written as 'Pollen fertility assessment in Rice (Oryza Sativa L.) in the F7 Generation of a Cross Pusa-1176 x BPT-5204.</p> <p>Introduction: Literature on pollen fertility studies need to be cited instead of genes identified for PGMS or TGMS for justification. Working out ratio of segregation is done in F2 and doing it in F7 is wrong.</p> <p>Material and methods: Mention the number of F7 families used for the study. Procedure followed to assess pollen fertility is adequate. If at all pollen viability is to be mentioned, then pollen germination procedure indicating pollen tube growth and classifying based on length of pollen tube should have been adopted and it is not done here. So this study pertains to only pollen fertility assessment. Pollen fertility or sterility classification has to be supported by the author who gave it.</p> <p>Results: Pollen fertility results obtained and classification made are ok. But working out ratio of segregation in F7 is wrong as it is done in F2. So applying the results to fit into chi-square is does not arise here. This should be omitted from the results. Thus Table 2 and graphs are to be deleted. The means of pollen fertility classes need to be tested for their significance using t-test and the results may be presented accordingly. Authors are advised not to present results in Table form again in graphical form.</p> <p>Discussion: Needs revision based on the above suggestion.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General 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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Eradasappa E
Department, University & Country	ICAR-DCR, India