

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_121494
Title of the Manuscript:	Genetic Analysis of F2 Population for Yield Enhancing Traits Under Direct Seed Condition in Rice (Oryza Sativa L.)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

[Review Form 3](#)

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript investigates the genetic variability in F2 populations of rice under direct-seeded conditions, which is highly relevant due to increasing water scarcity and labor shortages in agriculture. Understanding the genetics of rice suitable for aerobic conditions can significantly contribute to the development of rice varieties that are more sustainable and resource-efficient. The study's findings on traits with high genetic variability and heritability are valuable for breeding programs aiming to enhance rice yield and adaptability to direct-seeded conditions.</p> <p>Personal Opinion on the Manuscript: While the topic is important, the manuscript fails to meet several standards. The experimental design and statistical analyses are inadequately explained, leading to questions about the validity and reliability of the results. The manuscript would benefit from substantial revisions to improve its scientific rigor and readability.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is adequate, but a more descriptive alternative highlighting the study's outcome is recommended to improve its accessibility.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract requires a thorough revision to improve sentence flow. It is recommended to rewrite it. Ensure that abbreviations are explained upon their first appearance in both the text and the abstract.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The Introduction section is not sufficient; include details about recent studies related to the manuscript. The Materials and Methods section lacks subsections and does not adequately explain the parameters used in the study. This section needs to be rewritten to include detailed explanations of all experimental procedures and the parameters considered for the study.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>Introduction: Review and enhance the sentences for clarity. Avoid using terms like "poorest and undernourished people." Refrain from beginning paragraphs with abbreviations. Instead, start sentences with words like "The," "At," "Hence," etc., rather than directly using abbreviations at the beginning.</p> <p>Materials and methods: The first paragraph needs to be rewritten. Correct the spelling mistakes and ensure proper spacing between lines throughout the manuscript. Table 1 and Table 2 are not cited anywhere in the manuscript. In Table 2, it is necessary to explain the role of the gene or marker used in the study within the text.</p> <p>Results and Discussion: Needs thorough revision, read line to line and correct grammatical errors. Author clearly needs to explain the results. Mention whether the figure is of Parent lines or NILS or F2 in the text. Use sub-headings to easily convey readers. Figure headings must be rewritten. Either use abbreviations or full form in figure legends, not both. Explain figure 1, Figure 2 and Figure 3 separately. Discussion part needs further improvements. Statistical explanation is missing.</p> <p>Conclusion: Not sufficient. Conclusion should reflect the outcome of the whole study. Suggested not to use extra sentences not related to your study eg. "its attributing traits related to low soil P tolerance". Here the author has not mentioned about P soil status anywhere in manuscript.</p>	

Review Form 3

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references cited are not very recent. Reference missing in text: GRiSP. 2013. Rice almanac (4 th ed.). International Rice Research Institute.	
<u>Minor REVISION</u> comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Lacks scholarly communication, hence need grammatical revision.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	No consistency in the writing, for example use same format while mentioning varieties start with capital letters. No consistency (Eg: Table 3 and figures1-2. at one place and Table 3 and Fig1-2.in other place in the text). Maintain consistency. Figure 3 has many sub figures, label them as 3a, 3b, etc. Figures are jumbled and arrange them in standard format.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abhishree R
Department, University & Country	University of Agricultural Sciences, India