

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_120523
Title of the Manuscript:	PHENOTYPIC SCREENING OF ADVANCED BREEDING LINES FOR BLAST RESISTANCE IN RICE (<i>Oryza sativa</i> L.)
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 few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript carries scientific importance. I am appreciating the authors for their contribution. This type of preliminary selection method is necessary for obtaining disease resistant lines of rice against rice blast.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is appropriate from my site.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is clearly written. I have a comment for line no. 14-15. Please clarify it.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure of the manuscript is okay. However, the detailing of marker assisted pedigree breeding procedure should be included.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is correct from scientific point of view. The research gap for developing the blast resistant rice lines using phenotypic criteria is clearly mentioned in the manuscript. However, the adoption of single phenotypic evaluation trait is not sufficient enough to clarify the findings. Requesting to look over the comment regarding line no. 95-96.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	The references are minimum in number and almost cited from earlier findings. I am suggesting to include some recent references especially in the Discussion section according to finding. Also suggesting to improve the Discussion section as it is the core part of a manuscript.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The writing quality of the manuscript is suitable for scientific communication.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript would be in better form if the comments are addressed properly.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Md. Mehedi Hasan
Department, University & Country	Sylhet Agricultural University, Bangladesh