

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Experimental Agriculture International |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JEAI_121596 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Molecular confirmation of gall midge resistance in the phenotypically promising rice cultures by using SSR markers |
| Type of the Article | Original Research Article |

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. | It gives very good information for rice breeder regarding to gall midge resistance. It can introduce not only the markers but also resistance rice for international rice breeder. The methodology also well-defined and crystal clear for re-use by other rice breeder | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | To my opinion it is not suitable hence I suggest to be: "Molecular verification of gall midge resistance in rice cultures using SSR markers" | |
| 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 it is 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. | It follows appropriate methodology The result was well mentioned The objective is very clear | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | The result and discussion part was not supported well with more references. It seems shallowly supported with references indeed the result is well mentioned | |
| Minor REVISION comments | Not | |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | | |
| Optional/General comments | The author should improve the language He also support his result with more references | |

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> | |

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name: | Nigussie Kefelegn Woldecherkos |
| Department, University & Country | Debre Birehan Agricultural Research Centre, Ethiopia |