

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biotechnology and Genetic Engineering
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJBGE_98071
Title of the Manuscript:	GENETICS AND GENOMICS OF AROMA OF RICE AND ITS QUALITY ENHANCEMENT PARAMETERS: A REVIEW
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.journalajbge.com/index.php/AJBGE/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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. The manuscript is scientifically important, as it has provided useful information on genetics and genomics of aroma of rice and its quality enhancement parameters</p> <p>2. Yes, it is.</p> <p>3. The conclusion of the study was not well captured in the abstract.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure are appropriate but need more elaboration especially on those under the following headings: Grain quality improvement; Nutritional quality; Grain characteristics.</p> <p>5. Yes, I think so.</p> <p>6. I think the references are sufficient. A good number of them are recent with a few of them being old (more than 10 years). If the old ones can be replaced with recent ones, that will be perfect</p> <p>The author(s) failed to pay attention to grammatical details in a few areas. Apart from that, minor corrections that need to be made and some comments that must be addressed are indicated in the track changes in the manuscript. I recommend that the paper is good and should be published after the corrections have been duly made and the comments addressed.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Yes, I recommend that the paper is good and should be published after the few grammatical errors have been corrected	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

### 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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Julius Yirzagla
Department, University & Country	CSIR-SARI, Ghana