

[Review form 1.7](#)

Journal name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript number:	Ms_IJECC_97419
Manuscript Title:	Genetic divergence studies of dipping-tolerant rice genotypes
Item Type	

General guideline for the peer review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that NO manuscript should be rejected solely on the basis of "lack of novelty", as long as the manuscript is scientifically sound and technically sound.

For the complete guide to the peer review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>

PART 1: Review Comments

	reviewer comment	Author comment (if you agree with the reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. Authors are required to write their comments here)
<p>Mandatory REVIEW Feedback</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important to the scientific community? (Please write a few sentences in this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article appropriate? (If not, please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article complete?</p> <p>4. Are the 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 any suggestions for additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Other than the 6 points mentioned above, reviewers can provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript reveals: The background as well as the justification are pertinent to this investigation; Some studies previously carried out are shown that make clear the importance of this plant in the lives of people and its contribution to the economic and labor sense of those who dedicate themselves to the plantation of this product. In addition to the methodology that has been commented in the summary, it indicates that the Tocher method has been used, which in this case is viable for obtaining better results. The results are compared with those of other authors, this favors the new findings that are determined throughout the interpretation of results. Future lines of research are not mentioned. There are no conclusions of the study, this section is essential in achieving the objective of the investigation. Without this section the investigation is weakened and cannot proceed to its publication.</p> <p>2. It is conducive to research</p> <p>3. It is necessary to state the objective of the investigation; The methodology clearly shows the context of the research, the selection of the sample and the most relevant results generated by this study.</p> <p>4. The structure is incomplete because the Conclusion is missing. However, when this section is completed, it could be stated that it is pertinent.</p> <p>5. Due to the data, results, complementary tables that give reason for the study process, it can be integrated into the academic category.</p> <p>6. The references are very weak, it is suggested that they be at least between 30-40. These support the proposed research, strengthen the discussion and therefore the study. However, it is important to take into account the requirements of the Journal.</p>	
<p>Minor REVIEW Feedback</p> <p>1. Is the quality of the language/English of the article adequate for-scholarly communications?</p>	<p>It is appropriate</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The article provides important data on the cultivation of this plant. However, it has some deficiencies in the form and substance (conclusions) that must be taken into account if they wish to be published. In addition, the degree of similarity found must be lowered to 0%. With these recommendations it can be indicated that the article is publishable.</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:	Jeverson Santiago Quishpe Gaibor
Department, University & Country	Salesian Polytechnic University, Ecuador