

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_78523
Title of the Manuscript:	PHENOTYPIC SCREENING OF F4 BREEDING LINES AGAINST BACTERIAL BLIGHT DISEASE IN RICE
Type of the Article	Short Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)																																																																
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Please give the full meaning of these acronyms “SES, IRRI, 2013”since the introduction of the semi-dwarf high yielding varieties (HYV) of rice from the Philippines during mid-1960's and increased applications of nitrogen fertilizer in these rice varieties to encourages its occurrence. Did the increase application of the fertilizer increase the occurrence or it reduced it. Please recast the sentence. Delete the following from the first paragraph of your results and discussion as it does not add meaning to the paragraph “Susceptible check, MTU1010 showed highly susceptible reaction with disease score of 9. Resistant check, Improved Samba Mahsuri showed highly resistant reaction with disease score of 1 (Table 2)”. The highlighted parts of table 2 do not fit to the table. Give proper explanation or move to a separate table. Please link your explanation to no 2 above. <table border="1" data-bbox="931 890 1997 1423"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="3">S. No</th> <th rowspan="3">Parents and Checks</th> <th colspan="2">Reaction against BB</th> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="2">DX020</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Score</th> <th>HR/R/MR/S/HS</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>MTU1010</td> <td>9</td> <td>HS</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>ISM</td> <td>1</td> <td>HR</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>Pranahitha</td> <td>5</td> <td>MR</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Improved breeding lines (F₄)</td> <td>Score</td> <td>HR/R/MR/S/HS</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>KAL1</td> <td>3</td> <td>R</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>KAL 2</td> <td>3</td> <td>R</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>KAL 3</td> <td>3</td> <td>R</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>KAL 4</td> <td>3</td> <td>R</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>KAL 5</td> <td>3</td> <td>R</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>KAL 6</td> <td>3</td> <td>R</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>KAL 7</td> <td>3</td> <td>R</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8</td> <td>KAL 8</td> <td>3</td> <td>R</td> </tr> <tr> <td>9</td> <td>KAL 9</td> <td>3</td> <td>R</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10</td> <td>KAL 10</td> <td>5</td> <td>MR</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Figure 1 is not self-explanatory; please provide details in the figure. In your conclusion you only suggested that “breeding lines with excellent grain yield coupled with bacterial blight resistance could perform better in farmer’s field” after field triers. You did not suggest field triers with the moderately resistant ones. Results have shown that the best in the screen house experiment doesn’t prove they will remain the best after field tries. You don’t have Singh <i>et al.</i>, 2013 two in the same year while put Singh <i>et al.</i>, 2013b. You did more of copy and paste. If you site more than one reference at a time always site the oldest before the most recent e.g. “Singh <i>et al.</i>, 2013 and Agarwal <i>et al.</i>, 2005” Balachiranjeevi <i>et al.</i>, 2015 in the main body of the paper while Balachiranjeevi <i>et al.</i>, 	S. No	Parents and Checks	Reaction against BB		DX020		Score	HR/R/MR/S/HS	1	MTU1010	9	HS	2	ISM	1	HR	3	Pranahitha	5	MR		Improved breeding lines (F ₄)	Score	HR/R/MR/S/HS	1	KAL1	3	R	2	KAL 2	3	R	3	KAL 3	3	R	4	KAL 4	3	R	5	KAL 5	3	R	6	KAL 6	3	R	7	KAL 7	3	R	8	KAL 8	3	R	9	KAL 9	3	R	10	KAL 10	5	MR	
S. No	Parents and Checks			Reaction against BB																																																														
				DX020																																																														
		Score	HR/R/MR/S/HS																																																															
1	MTU1010	9	HS																																																															
2	ISM	1	HR																																																															
3	Pranahitha	5	MR																																																															
	Improved breeding lines (F ₄)	Score	HR/R/MR/S/HS																																																															
1	KAL1	3	R																																																															
2	KAL 2	3	R																																																															
3	KAL 3	3	R																																																															
4	KAL 4	3	R																																																															
5	KAL 5	3	R																																																															
6	KAL 6	3	R																																																															
7	KAL 7	3	R																																																															
8	KAL 8	3	R																																																															
9	KAL 9	3	R																																																															
10	KAL 10	5	MR																																																															

Review Form 1.6

	2018 is in the reference section. Correct appropriately 10. References are few and old with only four citations in the past five years 11. Citations in the Materials and Methods section are scanty with only two references cited. 12. Results and Discussions is inadequate and not explicit enough 13. Conclusion in the main body of the paper and in the abstract needs recasting as you can not recommend results that have not gone through field triers to farmers	
Minor REVISION comments	Needs minor revision	
Optional/General comments	Please refer to review comments above and effect all the corrections and suggestions outlined. The manuscript can be accepted for publication if all the corrections are effected.	

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:	Ogbebor O. Nicholas
Department, University & Country	Rubber Research Institute of Nigeria, Nigeria