

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_99021
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of rice varieties (<i>Oryza sativa</i> L.) on the basis of physiological and morphological traits
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Yes	
1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	Ok	
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Not proper and insufficient (Missing of experiment objective, design and exact conclusion)	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	Ok	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Insufficient	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	Objective of experiment is missing, Lack of proper experimental details and statistical methods applied, If multiple genotype for a particular trait were performing outstanding and there were no significant difference among there performance (statistically at per), in that case all those genotype should be given equal importance., In conclusion there is need to provide some suggestion rather than restating observations obtained from experiment. Also, if experimental materials are OP, then what is the need for discussion of advance generation with out laid out any crossing programme?	
6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)		
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Subhamoy Sikder
Department, University & Country	Uttar Banga Krishi Viswavidyalaya, India