

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_103441
Title of the Manuscript:	Agro-morphological characterization for evaluation of potential upland red rice cultivars of Manipur
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>)

Review Form 1.7

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. It is of moderate important.</p> <p>2. My suggested title is "Evaluation of potential upland red rice cultivars of Manipur using agro-morphological characterization".</p> <p>3. Not comprehensive. There is no objective in the abstract.</p> <p>4. They are appropriate.</p> <p>5. Yes, correct.</p> <p>6. Yes, sufficient.</p> <p>REVIEWER COMMENT: Introduction section: - It needs to elaborate on the conceptual issues and hypothesis. And as there is no objective of the study in the introduction and the abstract as well, it needs to describe the objective(s). - Using the word "rices" is grammatically wrong. It might be rice cultivars or species. Material and methods section: - It needs to describe the measuring/calculation methods of plant height, LAI, the yields (quintals per hectare), and harvest index, and the tillage techniques. - There is no mention about the cultivars conducted in the study. It needs to describe the cultivars' names and the numbers of the cultivars conducted. Results and discussion - It needs to describe what the abbreviation "DAS" stands for. DAS = Day After Sowing. - All tables need to explain what the abbreviations stand for, as footnote. Conclusion: - The highlighted major findings supporting the hypothesis should be described quantitative descriptions rather than the words "maximum".</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Average	
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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Zar Ni Zaw
Department, University & Country	Prince of Songkla University, Thailand