

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_76826
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of heat tolerance potential in QTL introgressed lines of hybrid rice restorer, KMR-3R through PS-II efficiency
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: (<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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	<p>The authors have assessed the heat tolerance of the IL by studying the effect of heat stress at reproductive stage on several photosynthesis related parameters, which is a good approach. However, it would be helpful to further strengthen the results by showing data on the growth and yield parameters.</p> <p>Other physiological parameters can also be included to indicate the superiority of ILs over IL1 and the parent line.</p> <p>A discussion of the result is missing in the manuscript. Although the authors have tried to cite the research supporting their result a mechanistic discussion would improve the quality of the manuscript.</p> <p>A conclusion stating the most superior introgressed line would be helpful for highlighting the deliverable of the research and may provide leads for future work</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Growth and yield parameters are not available. We are unable to collect the yield data during the experiment.2. Other physiological parameters are not available.3. As suggested, discussion part was modified.4. As suggested, conclusion was added to the manuscript.
Minor REVISION comments	Discussion can be improved. A proper conclusion and inference of the research is lacking and can be provided. The better performance of the ILs is clear but authors can analyse the results further to state the best performing line	Changes were made as per the suggestions.
Optional/General comments	Please go through the manuscript for grammar and language correction once. Few sentences and paragraph need attention from this perspective.	Corrections were made and the changes were highlighted.

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)	We extremely thankful to the editorial team and anonymous reviewers for their valuable suggestions to improve the manuscript.