

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_114307
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Germplasm for Reproductive Stage Salinity Tolerance in Rice (<i>Oryza sativa</i> L.)
Type of the 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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The selection method and the selected genotypes are solutions adapted to a local environment with high salinity characteristics. Therefore, the solution is important for the scientific world, firstly as genotypes that adapt with reasonable performance to environments with high salinity, and secondly, as a regional or local solution that can be integrated into a database dedicated to rice cultivation. 2. Yes the title of the article is suitable. 3. Yes the abstract of the article is comprehensive. 4. Yes the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. 5. Overall, the article, in a general form, is correct. However, essential parts are missing: geographic coordinates of the experimental field, climatic conditions, sketch of the experimental field, photographs of the experimental field in various stages of rice culture development. We need to know how many plants entered the experiment and what area the experimental field had. Give at least a minimum of images of the development of different, visibly different genotypes, see the added literature [1], [2], [3], [4], etc. Without experimental evidence, I do not recommend publication. However, it is not me who decides, but the editor. 6. The references are sufficient and recent. There are two works in the list of references whose citations in the text I did not find. The list of references and citations does not conform to the Journal Template. <p>Additional literature added by the reviewer</p> <p>[1] Mostafa Ahmadizadeh, Naireen A. Vispo, Cecilia Diana O. Calapit-Palao, Iris Dawn Pangaan, Celia Dela Vinãa, Rakesh K. Singh, Reproductive stage salinity tolerance in rice: a complex trait to phenotype, Indian Journal of Plant Physiology, 21(4), 2016</p> <p>[2] Farooq, M., Hussain, M., Wakeel, A. <i>et al.</i> Salt stress in maize: effects, resistance mechanisms, and management. A review. <i>Agron. Sustain. Dev.</i> 35, 461–481 (2015). https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-015-0287-0</p> <p>[3] Sandesh GM, Gowda DCA, Rajanna MP, Assessing salinity tolerance of rice genotypes for germination and early seedling growth</p> <p>[4] rice experimental fields, scheme, images - Search Images (bing.com)</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>There are many errors in English, especially in articulation. Secondly, there are many pasted words and inappropriate spaces. In the attached peer-reviewed manuscript, I have pointed out only a few of the errors. Authors must do a grammar check of the English language with the text editor, or specialized programs (Grammarly, QuillBot, etc.). For statements in the most academic style possible QuillBot Paraphrasing. Pay attention to the English version approved by the publisher (UK, US, India, or other).</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Considering the lack of experimental evidence and poor writing (spacing, grammatical mistakes), I gave a grade of 6 and recommended a major revision followed by a new review. I believe that a minimum of experimental evidence would be necessary, but it remains the editor's choice. For the Figure 1, it is recommended to increase the size of the figures on the axes.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Cardei Petru
Department, University & Country	The National Institute of Research – Development for Machines and Installations Designed for Agriculture and Food Industry, Romania