

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_121573
Title of the Manuscript:	Phenotypic Screening of Rice cultures for resistance against Brown Plant Hopper, Nilaparvata lugens (Stal) at Warangal
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <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.	The manuscripts presents an important study through screening different rice cultures to identify those resistant to insect damage due to B Brown planthopper (BPH), one of the most destructive insect pests in rice production. The findings of the study are relevant and have practical application to minimise use of pesticides. The resistant lines can also be used in breeding programs as potential donors	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable, very clearly and simply presented	
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.	I have added what I thought was needed more	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes. Author presented them as per the journal guidelines	
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 manuscript has scientific relevancy as already stated in above	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	<p>The references were mostly recent/ However, the author did not follow the Journal guidelines of writing. Citing references in the text. For example, the first reference was shown as [9]. not as. [11]. the next reference should be [2]., but the author showed [11]., then followed by [4] [21, [17. .</p> <p>One question to me, where does the order come from? Was the author just copying them from another Journal and pasting them directly in their write up, without re-arranging them to fit their own manuscript</p> <p>Even the listing of references has to be revisited: For example, the current reference [9]. should be [1].</p> <p>Bottom issue: Author to begin re-numbering the references starting from [1]. in the text, followed by [2].</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The subsections (Abstract, introduction, results/discussion/ conclusion were written in good English, only the materials and methods subsection had a problem: I HAVE tried to edit some parts of the subsection using the past tense	
Optional/General comments	I SUGGESTED THE TABLES TO BE PRESENTED USING A STANDRAD TABLE FORMAT AS I HAVE EDITED TABLE 1, 2,3	

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:	Annet Namayanja
Department, University & Country	National Agricultural Research Organisation, National Crops Resources Research Institute, Uganda