

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_114532
Title of the Manuscript:	SELECTION INDEX IN RAINFED UPLAND RICE (Oryza sativa L.)
Type of the Article	Experimental article

Review Form 1.7

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. Yes. Undoubtedly, this article makes a significant contribution to the development of rice cultivation, breeding and agricultural science. The results obtained by the author are an important component of the global fight against drought and food security. 2. Yes 3. Yes/No. The abstract should be supplemented with the obtained experimental data. 4. Yes 5. Yes 7. No. The literary sources presented by the authors are outdated. Only 6 (23%) of 26 literary sources were published in the last 10 years. It is generally accepted that at least 50% of literary sources in the article should be published in the last 10 years. The conclusions, as well as the abstract, should be supplemented with experimental data. That is, to state specific results that were obtained. There are no references in the text to Tables 1 and 2. I would advise you to describe Table 2 in more detail, because it contains a lot of information, and the description for it is very short. This will make the scientific aspect of this article even better.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is 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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dmytro Chuiko
Department, University & Country	State Biotechnological University, Ukraine