

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_105058
Title of the Manuscript:	Identification of transgressive segregants for yield and yield attributing traits in F2 population obtained from the cross between Naveen x IR 64 Drt1.
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.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)
<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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1- Certainly, the manuscript is of notable importance to the scientific community, particularly those involved in agricultural genetics and rice cultivation. With a rising global population and the imperative need to enhance rice production even with limited resources, the identification and utilization of transgressive segregants present a promising avenue for crop improvement. This study offers insights into the genetic mechanisms that can be exploited to produce rice strains with superior yield and adaptability.</p> <p>2- While the title gives a basic understanding of the study's aim, it may benefit from more specificity. A suggestion could be: "Identification and Analysis of Transgressive Segregants in F2 Rice Populations: A Cross-Study of Naveen x IR 64 Drt1 for Enhanced Yield Traits."</p> <p>3- Yes, this abstract could summarize the objectives, methods, results, and conclusions of the study succinctly.</p> <p>4- Yes, the manuscript follows a traditional scientific format with clear sections like Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results and Discussion, and Conclusion. This structure ensures that the content is organized and easy to follow, enabling readers to understand the context, methodology, findings, and implications of the research.</p> <p>5- Based on the provided content, the manuscript seems scientifically sound. It has utilized an appropriate methodology, presented detailed results, and discussed the findings in the context of existing literature.</p> <p>6- The article cites numerous references, implying a well-researched background. In modern scientific research, it's essential to ensure that references are both relevant and up-to-date, encompassing the most recent advancements in the field.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the article seems largely suitable for scholarly communications. The content is clear and conveys complex scientific ideas. However, there are some phrases and terms that could be refined or clarified for better clarity and understanding. It may benefit from a thorough proofreading or review by a professional language editor, especially to ensure consistency and address any minor grammatical or syntactic issues. Some sentences are quite long and might benefit from restructuring to enhance readability.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Ehsan Khodadadi
Department, University & Country	University of Arkansas, USA