

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_104839
Title of the Manuscript:	Molecular characterization of Rice genotypes using molecular markers
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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This research could be important to rice breeders in their region, although this manuscript requires major corrections. 2. The title is suitable. 3. The abstract is comprehensive. There are some suggestions, though. For example, the real name of the primers should be used (for example: UBC801) and no ISSR801 because it causes confusion. 4. The subsections are ok. 5. The manuscript is scientifically correct. 6. The references are sufficient and recent. Despite this, inclusion of the references in the discussion is poor. 7. Names and locations of some of the tables are wrong. 8. Figure 3 does not show the Clusters A or B. 9. One or two representative gels should be chosen from all shown in the article, and the genotype names should be incorporated into the picture for better representation. The remaining gels and could go to supplementary material. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	The English is overall well written, except some observations in the MS:	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	There are many comments and suggestions in the manuscript.	

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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Julio Alfonso Chia Wong
Department, University & Country	Universidad Nacional Agraria de la Selva, Perú