

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 (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 manuscript has been prepared based on the performance evaluation of 19 genotypes in Rice; solely, it is a pre-breeding task. Estimating the nature of gene action for the particular traits of study deserves a further breeding scheme. The selection of appropriate plant materials, i.e., breeding lines like 5 lines that is BPH susceptible and 2 testers that are BPH resistant and checks lines, i.e., one BPH resistant and variety, is the main strength of this manuscript.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title contained multiple mistakes. I think Understanding is not an appropriate word to represent Research activities, and there is some punctuation missing. I would like to recommend the title as ... Analysis of gene action and combining ability for growth and yield associated traits in Rice (<i>Oryza sativa</i> L.)using a LinexTester analysis method.	
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 found various errors in the abstract. In the first sentence, in place of 'know,' I need to use 'understand.' Some sentences are suspected of plagiarism, so I need to rewrite them. There was a blunder while writing. Among the lines, WGL 962 was the best combination ...actually lines are not combination ...so need to write as ...among the lines WGL 962 has demonstrated best performance for grain yield and important yield components. More over in the last sentence in place of upcoming breeding need to write as Further breeding	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	I think the sub-section of the manuscript is not well laid out .First need to provide numbers from introduction to result and discussion. In the section of (3) Result and discussion: need to break down 3.1 ANOVA for combining ability 3.2 Estimates of combining ability variances and gene action 3.3 General and specific combining ability effects	
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.	First, keywords should be written in full form. GCA and SCA should be written in full form, and LinexTester should be replaced by LinexTester analysis. In the section of Introduction, there are hardly 2 citations, so this section needs to elaborate with more citations. At least 4-5 citation additions would be very good. Furthermore, a more weakly written portion of the manuscript is the materials and method. There are various software and methods for estimating combining ability via linextester analysis The technique adopted by authors should be written, TNAU STAT, SAS, SPSS, R, or which method and software authors have employed should be determined. In the same section, we need to write in detail about the preparation of hybrids lines and what the sampling and measurement procedures of the studied traits should be written clearly. To be very frank, there needs to be some citations in the materials and method section while following previously done methods.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	I need to add more citations in the section of Introduction and Materials and Method sections.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The standard of English employed in this manuscript is of average type and found not used as appropriately as I have denoted early in the abstract section. so need to improvise the standard of the English.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	(1) Abstract re write correction of denoted errors and removing plagiarism (2) Addition of few more citation in the section of Introduction (3) Details elaboration of materials and methods section including few citation (4) Result and discussion should provide sub section numbers	

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:	Rameshwar Rai
Department, University & Country	Madan Bhandari University of Science and Technology(MBUST), Nepal