

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_119549
Title of the Manuscript:	Unraveling promising genetic variability associated with strong culm and yield parameters in inter sub-specific cross derived recombinant inbred lines in rice (Oryza sativa L.)
Type of the Article	Original Research 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 „**Jack 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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/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>The work has a very significant scientific and economic interest, especially for countries that produce and consume a lot of rice.</p> <p>The article presents an innovative solution to a significant problem in the field, but the methodology requires further clarification and validation.</p> <p>The title is appropriate but a little long.</p> <p>The abstract is clear and very explicit, but the problematic was timidly presented.</p> <p>The article is well-written and well-structured, but the authors need to provide more details on the experimental setup and procedure.</p> <p>The discussion and conclusion also require further analysis.</p> <p>The article's literature review is complete, sufficient and fairly recent.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The authors have made a valuable contribution to the literature, and the writing English quality is acceptable for its clarity and readability.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The introduction is very interesting, but it's too long: there are parts that don't belong here, and would be more useful in the materials and methods section.</p> <p>The conclusion is a kind of repetition of the discussion of the results;</p> <p>The authors should try to draw the consequences of their work and propose possible effective perspectives.</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:	Cheniti Khalissa
Department, University & Country	Fehat ABBAS University, Setif 1, Algeria