

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_106887
Title of the Manuscript:	Development of mapping population segregating for sucking pest resistance in cotton
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>Yes. The manuscript describes the identification of the sucking pest resistant and susceptible/ high yielding cotton variety by assessing the anatomical and fibre quality parameters. This investigation is the first step in the process of developing cotton varieties with sucking pest resistant and high cotton yield. As a futuristic measure if the variety as said is developed, such variety can reduce drastic losses caused by sucking pest with higher yield.</p> <p>No. Identification of contrasting parents and development of mapping population for sucking pest resistance in cotton</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes (partially). The utilization of the polymorphic SSR marker (Between parents) for confirming true-hybrid in the F1 population is questionable, as the SSR markers are expressed in co-dominant form in F1 population . Therefore, the F1 lines viz., 1, 11, 19 and 29 without the parent alleles needs explanation by the authors. Moreover, the keen observation of Fig 3 shows heterozygous banding pattern for 1st and 11th F1 line, but authors have not recognized it in the manuscript. Therefore, I serious doubt the method of testing true-hybrid nature through polymorphic SSR as suggested by the authors.</p> <p>The literature quoted is not sufficient and needs to add many references, especially in Introduction section and Results and discussion section.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The presentation of the manuscript contains grammatical mistakes. The discussion on the results of the experiment and comparison of results with the prior literature is missing. The authors have not included the literature and importance of SSR markers in this study in Introduction section. The Results and discussion section contains only results of the experiment but the discussion and comparison with the previous literature is missing. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The presentation of the manuscript contains grammatical mistakes. The discussion on the results of the experiment and comparison of results with the prior literature is missing. 	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	N Chandrakanth
Department, University & Country	Central Sericultural Research and Training Institute, India