

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_84909
Title of the Manuscript:	SCREENING FOR BACTERIAL LEAF BLIGHT RESISTANT GENES IN RICE USING SSR MARKERS
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.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy>)

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	Despite being a short article, it is not clearly stated what objective is pursued. They only show evidence of an amplification profile but the sequence evidence corroborates that the amplified fragment corresponds to the loci of interest analyzed. The results are not discussed from a perspective. Table 1 needs to be better edited to make it clearer to analyze Improve Table 1 to facilitate analysis Remove the style paragraph from the table (lines 68 to 71) Raise a discussion of the results, based on the importance of the result achieved	Though this study was aimed to identify the BLB resistant genes using SSR markers, no further sequencing approaches were carried out. The identifications were done based on the band sizes of the control genotypes. The authors did not have enough funding for sequencing of the amplified fragments. The discussion of the results was added and highlighted at the end of the RESULTS AND DISCUSSION section. Table 1 was modified. The style paragraph from the table (lines 68 to 71) was removed. In the line 89-90, it was suggested to add information of the sequence of the fragments.
Minor REVISION comments		
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	Not applicable