

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_100666
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Rice ( <i>Oryza sativa</i> L.) Hybrids under Agro-climatic Conditions of Prayagraj in Kharif - 2022
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> )

### 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. Rice is India's staple food, researches on how best to improve and increase its yield is very important to fight starvation by feeding over one billion people. Hybrid crops are proving good to avoid hunger and starvation.</p> <p>2. Suitable</p> <p>3. No research gap in the opening sentences. There are no aims, objectives and the methodologies of the research.</p> <p>4. Good. Yield parameters need to be stated in the methodology</p> <p>5. Correct. There is double referencing which should be corrected.</p> <p>6. Partially increase to above 20</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Good	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>1. Improve on referencing</p> <p>2. Conclusion needs expansion</p> <p>3. A methodology should be clear, a step by step narration in brief.</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>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Shumba Tobias Takawira</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Harare Polytechnic, Zimbabwe</b>