

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_99835
Title of the Manuscript:	Biochemical basis of resistance in rice to yellow stem borer, <i>Scirpophaga incertulas</i> Wik.
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>)

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>Abstract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The abstract can be added with few findings such as what are the resistant entries identified, few values of significance in the biochemical analysis can be given. <p>Introduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the introduction, the reference of Kumar, 1997 is not relevant to rice crop. It is related to brinjal crop. Such type of misleading information may be avoided in the scientific writings. <p>Materials and Methods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replace the word 'control' for the varieties it can be given as 'check entries' No need to provide fertilizer dosage as it is common to all the accessions. And also it is not agronomic experiment. Just mention the recommended fertilizer doses has been incorporated in the field trial plot. Instead provide the details of field lay out, plot size for each accession, replications, plants maintained in each etc.. Though the method of IRRI followed for screening, please mention how many plants / tillers observed, how the damage was assessed, what are the symptoms recorded etc. <p>Results and Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The results should be provided for all the entries or the range of damage should be given. The data in the results showed only for 6 entries and even for the check entry Suraksha the data was not provided. In the experiment, dead heart data was not indicated. As the stem borer initially cause dead heart and there must be variation in the vegetative stage of the crop in the stem borer attack. The R&D part need to be improved. There are vast amount literatures and earlier works on screening and plant resistant to stem borer are available for discussion. <p>Tables:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In all the 6 tables, the same white ear data was given. It's not necessary to get the count of tables. It can be given in one table. <p>1. Yes. The topic is important in view of increased stem borer attack on rice crop in recent years.</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. No. It requires modification as indicated in the comments</p> <p>4. Yes</p> <p>5. More data and relevant details indicated in the comments are to be included.</p> <p>6. Latest references can be added in the discussion and reference</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	No. Need to improve considerably	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research work seems to be part of project of thesis work. Hence, the additional data which is mentioned in the comments may be available. That can be incorporated to obtain this manuscript as complete research paper. The comments may be considered to improve further for accepting the research manuscript 	

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:	R .P. Soundararajan
Department, University & Country	Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, India