

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_127167
Title of the Manuscript:	UNDERSTANDING GENE ACTION AND COMBINING ABILITY IN RICE (<i>Oryza sativa</i> L.) A LINE x TESTER ANALYSIS APPROACH
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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.	This topic aims to increase yield rice through combining ability analysis. It will be response to identify desirable genotypes and hybrids which could be used for commercial hybrid creation. It contributes to reduce the food insecurity.	
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.	In the abstract, mentioned the context, main objective, methods, results and conclusion.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<p>Introduction: Mentioned the ecology area study suited to select lines rice for more production. Justify the supplying demand to clarify the problems regarding the productivity. More precisely, indicates the problems meet by farmers declining the reasons for improvement yield rice in this area study. Referenced each sentence which attests the prior studies in line with topic. In contrast with diallel analysis, explain why Line x Tester crosses was privileged. Rewrite the main objective because the study was not carried out on biotic or abiotic factors. In this section, authors cited one reference. Complete all paragraph with appropriate references for each sentence.</p> <p>Material and Methods: Subdivide this section within subsections namely plant material, area study, crossing, experimental design, all subsections must be detailed clearly. Integrate the genetic analysis more precisely concerning the Griffing method which enable to do ANOVA and estimate ratio GCA/SCA and mean square for all traits. Justify equally the utilization of five lines rice. The trait was governed by additive gene action if ratio GCA/SCA was higher than unity. In Contrast, the non-additive gene action was predominant. GCA effects reflect the additive effect while SCA effect reflects the dominance and epistasic effects.</p> <p>Results and discussion: little reference was used to discuss the results. "Various studies in rice by other researchers" specified the previous studies.</p> <p>Conclusion: Bring out all specific objectives.</p>	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically	Although the topic is crucial but authors must be take all suggestions aforementioned regarding sections and subsections.	

Review Form 3

robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	NO. Little references were used. Complete with recent references.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	YES	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Aladji Abatchoua Madi Madi Ibram
Department, University & Country	University of Ebolowa, Cameroon