

Review Form 3

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

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 MS is important considering the external factors affecting the adaptability of rice variety with the changing climate which makes it interesting when it comes to finding climate resilient variety and their regional based mass recommendation to the farming community.	
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.	The article section could be improved. This section lacks the brief explanation of characteristics feature related to the recommended variety. It is essential to mention the attributes of the recommended variety found through the current research problem which would make it more comprehensive.	
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.	<p>This MS is scientifically correct but it lacks appropriate articulation. For more understanding of the flaws related to the current MS, the authors are requested to go through the attached MS where the deficiencies are mentioned in the track change mode.</p> <p>To mention few of the lacuna:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abstract section lacks the brief explanation of characteristics feature related to the recommended variety. • Many references are missing since the material method section lacks many explanations related to the findings of the current problem. • Material and Method section needs to be more rigorous and must include all the methodologies related to the findings obtained in this current study; <p>For example, this section lacks the following attributes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Disease scoring criteria ○ Quantitative estimation procedures followed for amylose, proline, chlorophyll ○ The details of PEG treatments, chlorophyll stability index and molecular markers are missing in this section • The result section (line 156 onwards), the experimental explanation is unclear related to the treatments of PEG-induced stress which should have included the concentration of the PEG applied for stress induction at subsequent levels to promote accumulation of proline (as mentioned in the table 6). • The conclusion section must contain the parameters that make TKM 15 the most suitable one for field level recommendation with a comparison to the other varieties taken under the current study to showcase the superiority of the said variety. • The details of the figures should be provided below the figure instead at the top. • Figure 1 is nowhere cited inside the text! Moreover, figure 1 can be better represented in the form if a table since it depicts series of events over the years. 	

Review Form 3

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Adding more to the introduction and material methods section could make more significant improvement in terms of citing more references.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, it is acceptable.	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Follow the prescribed template for citation in the journal authors guideline section (sample template). Incorporate the tables and figures immediately after citing them inside the text rather than putting them altogether at the end of the MS. Follow the articles in the archive section in the journal homepage for clarity. The authors must mention the following sections: Acknowledgement, competing interests and Authors' contributions added as a continuation after the conclusion section. Since table 1 is representative of a large population it is imperative to mention the values as Mean \pm SD It is highly recommended to check for further typo errors in the MS apart from the changes made in track change mode. 	

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:	Udit Nandan Mishra
Department, University & Country	Sri Sri University, India