

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_117028
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploration of different Mycoflora on stored Rice Grains
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/editorial-policy>)

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"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Not suitable. Title of the manuscript is not reflecting the actual content covered. I would suggest an alternative title as 'An insight on mycoflora associated with rice grain discolouration'</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Review and references cited in the manuscript are not sufficient. Need to add few more reviews of recent years, pertaining to the objective of study.</p> <p>Introduction: Check the production data of rice. Ambiguity in the production data cited according to the reference [1].</p> <p>Materials and Methods: The content described under the section 2.1 seems inadequate. The information on the experimental set up, season and year of experiment conducted in required.</p> <p>Check the formula of disease incidence (%). While mentioning the parameters, /1mt is not required in the formula.</p> <p>Under section 2.2, exploration of mycoflora, does the author followed any standard protocol? If so, mention it.</p> <p>The word used 'frequency of mycoflora' doesn't seems appropriate for the observations recorded and results presented. However, the formula for the calculation of mycoflora frequency is mentioned as infected grain per sample. How does these parameters/observations relate?</p> <p>Under section 1.3 the morphometric and molecular characterization of mycoflora associated with grain discolouration is presented. Firstly, verify the subsection numbering as it is not in a sequence. Further, the methodology covered under this section is not adequate. Need to elaborate the methods followed.</p> <p>Under section 1.4, again verify the numbering of the section and version of SPSS software used for analysis is mentioned as 2.2. Is this correct? Verify.</p> <p>Results and Discussion</p> <p>The frequency of mycoflora mentioned is might actually the percentage of contribution of a fungal species out of total fungal species isolated. The word '% contribution' seems appropriate in place of 'frequency of pathogen'.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>Figure 1 mentioned is duplication of Table 1. No need to keep Fig. 1</p> <p>Discussion part is missing in all the subsections of results and discussion.</p> <p>Table 3. Mention the foot note as the values are mean of replicates. (How many replicates were maintained during the study ?)</p> <p>Under the section numbered as 1.3 depicts the morphometric analysis. However, the actual description depicts the morphoanalysis of the spore structures, no metrics/measurement analysis done. Need to incorporate the complete morphometric analysis of the spore/spore bearing structure of the fungal isolates.</p> <p>Figure 4; the photographs of A quadrilineatus, Penicillium sp., are not clear.</p> <p>Recheck the consent provided</p> <p>Provide the references according the journal's guidelines.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	--	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	--	

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:	Raghunandan B.L.
Department, University & Country	Anand Agricultural University, India