

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_127749
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of submergence tolerant improved restorer lines for fertility restoration and phosphorus use efficiency using gene-specific markers in rice ( <i>Oryza sativa</i> L.)
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 1: Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	<b>This paper succeeded in discussing and reviewing the scientific importance of some improved and flood-resistant rice accessions, focusing on studying the effect of phosphorus levels in this regard. It also focused on using some molecular specific markers to differentiate between tolerant and sensitive genotypes.</b>	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	<b>Yes, the title is very appropriate.</b>	
<b>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.</b>	<b>Yes, the abstract is comprehensive and covers all the research points.</b>	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	<b>Yes, the paper was prepared in a scientifically sound manner, which ensures that the results are presented well, and this is very clear.</b>	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	<b>Yes, the references are sufficient and there is no need to increase their number.</b>	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	<b>Yes, the language level is suitable for scientific communication.</b>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	There are some corrections in the manuscript in yellow.	

#### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

#### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Almoatzebella Ali El-Mouhamady Hassan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>National Research Centre, Egypt</b>