

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_123694
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing different rice genotypes resistance against the major pests and identifying the biochemical basis of resistance
Type of the 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>
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.	Review comments: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The author has conducted the study for assessing the resistant genotypes against rice stem borer and leaf folder and revealed that total plant sugar is the major factor that influence the insect infestation. However the addition of correlation study of weather parameters along with the percent of insect infestation would have given more information to the study2. In concern with both the insect infestation, instead of using the term 'Resistance' it will be more feasible to use the term 'Tolerance' as the term 'Resistance' means there should not be any infestation by the said insects in resistant rice genotypes3. In regards with the scale of resistance mentioned in the study, if it is standard scale for assesment of insect resistance in rice, reference should be mentioned.4. Typing error are observed in the menuscrypt, needs some more corrections including the scientific names5. In introduction part, rice productivity in India, recent data need to be included along with references6. The author used two susceptible genotypes for the study, it would have been more informative, if the authors provides the images of infestation caused by the insects (stem borer and leaf folder) in both susceptible and resistant genotypes (for visual comparision)7. Inclusion of molecular markers would have been good choice to make more informative for the current study8. Corrections required in references	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		

Review Form 3

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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		
<u>Minor REVISION</u> comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> 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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mihir Rabha
Department, University & Country	Central Sericultural Research and Training Institute, India