

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	Original Scientific Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<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>I appreciate this manuscript because it presents a comprehensive approach to screening a large number of rice genotypes, providing detailed analysis of their resistance to significant pests. The correlation between biochemical factors and pest resistance is particularly compelling, offering practical applications for breeding resistant varieties. However, the manuscript could benefit from more clarity in presenting some of the experimental results and their implications.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title "Assessing different rice genotypes resistance against the major pests and identifying the biochemical basis of resistance" is suitable as it reflects the core content of the manuscript. It clearly indicates the focus on resistance assessment and biochemical analysis, which are the main objectives of the study.</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 provides a good overview of the study, including the objectives, methodology, key findings, and implications. However, it could be improved by briefly mentioning the specific biochemical factors (such as phenols, sugars, etc.) that were identified as contributing to resistance. This would give readers a clearer understanding of the study's key outcomes.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript is well-structured with clearly defined sections that logically flow from one to the next. The introduction effectively sets the stage for the study, the materials and methods are detailed, and the results are presented in a comprehensive manner. However, the discussion section could be enhanced by integrating the findings more cohesively with existing literature, offering a deeper comparative analysis.</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>This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. The methods used for screening the rice genotypes and the subsequent biochemical analysis are appropriate and align with standard practices in plant pathology and entomology. The study's results are supported by well-executed experiments, and the conclusions drawn are reasonable based on the data presented.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references are sufficient and include recent studies relevant to the topic. The manuscript cites key research in the field, ensuring that it is grounded in current scientific understanding. If additional references are needed, it could be useful to include more recent studies on the genetic aspects of resistance in rice to provide a broader context.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> The language and English quality are generally suitable for scholarly communication, but a few grammatical corrections and improvements in sentence structure would enhance readability.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Consider refining the figures and tables to improve clarity and ensure that they effectively complement the text.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Overall, this is a well-conducted study that provides significant contributions to the field. Further research could expand on these findings by exploring the genetic basis of the observed biochemical traits, which could be an interesting direction for future work.</p> <p>Based on the overall quality of the manuscript, including the scientific rigor, clarity of presentation, and the potential impact of the findings, I would recommend a Minor Revision with a score of 8.5/10. This recommendation is based on the need for slight improvements in the clarity of the results and discussion sections, as well as minor language edits. The study is strong overall but could benefit from these revisions to enhance its contribution to the scientific community.</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	Vipin Kumar Pandey
Department, University & Country	Indira Gandhi Krishi Vishvavidyalaya, India