

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_117053
Title of the Manuscript:	Physiological Responses of Stress Tolerant Rice Varieties across Different Cropping Systems under Rainfed Stress
Type of the Article	Original 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 1.7

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. 6. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 7. 8. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes. The topic of this work is one of interest considering the increased need for food to meet the demands of the continuously growing global population, as well as to cultivate the most suitable cultivars to face the incident of abiotic stress factors, such as high temperatures and drought. Climate change also affects crops and as such, studies dedicated to finding the most suitable solutions to counteract the negative effects caused by global warming are welcome. Yes Yes No. I have done some recommendations. Please see the reviewed manuscript. I have done some recommendations. Please see the reviewed manuscript. More recent citations would have been welcome.	Thank you for your valuable suggestions. All the needed corrections have been incorporated in the revised manuscript. Changes made have been highlighted for kind consideration. These suggestions have proven to be necessary for the refinement of the manuscript.
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
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>	