

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_125547
Title of the Manuscript:	"Rice Production in Water-Scarce Environments: A Review Of Conservation Agriculture Techniques"
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/> Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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)
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.	This is a very important paper because it solves an important problem of overutilisation of water by irrigating farmers for rice cultivation. It is a practice here in India to keep paddy crops inundated and waste costly water stored behind dams. I like the manuscript because it has thought about saving water in a number of ways.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	One or two sentences adding various types of conservation agricultural practices (only titles) as discussed in the paper should have been added in the abstract.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes.	
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.	The discussion on SRI is really nice. Like "SRI has been shown to increase rice yields by 20-50% (Uphoff, 2003), reduce water usage by 25-50% (Dobermann, 2004), improve soil fertility and structure through organic amendments and minimal tillage (Uphoff, 2003), reduce methane emissions by 50% (Wassmann <i>et al.</i> , 2010), and increase farmer income through higher yields and reduced production costs". Similarly explanation on both advantages and disadvantages for use of "The SUB1" gene, which confers tolerance to submergence and drought, has also been introgressed into various rice varieties (Xu <i>et al.</i> , 2006). While these varieties offer improved yields under drought conditions, challenges remain, including limited availability and access, varietal differences in drought tolerance, and potential trade-offs in yield potential under non-drought conditions (Kumar <i>et al.</i> , 2014)- is complete and makes the fact of getting access to this type of SUB1 gene around the world in terms of achieving food security is the good scientific idea. Like this all other CA methods thought of are covered with scientific facts.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes. Highly readable quality.	
Optional/General comments	It is a good paper -short and succinct.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	C J Jagdeesha
Department, University & Country	Karunya University - Karunya Institute of Technology and Sciences, India