

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JSRR_121810</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>TKM 15 -A High yielding, short duration rice variety suitable for direct sown water limited areas of Tamil Nadu</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <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 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.	These article is very important for scientific community, and all habitants of rice production region envolved. It brings a new technology, that could increase the yelds on rice farms, and, consequently, helps to mitigate problem like hungry and low incomes on field. I really hope more studies like that could be in progress around the world.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it is.	
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.	Yes, the abstract of the manuscript is comprehensive and easy to understand, givin to the reader a real notion of the work.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the work is well structured and appropriate.	
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.	I think this article is scientifically suitable and robust. Technically, studies like that are laborious and time-consuming because they require several experiments and different locations for validation. The authors reported that they did a lot of experiments along many years, with blunt results, given an extremely important idea of accuracy about the conclusion.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The work is very well referenced. No suggestions to do.	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The quality of written English is very good, and properly to academic use.	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	The suggestions were directly pointed in the attached manuscript file. Please make sure that the author's will consider the markings.	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Mastrangelo Enivar Lanzaova</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>State University of Rio Grande Do Sul, Brazil</b>