

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_89854
Title of the Manuscript:	Genetic Analysis for Grain Yield and its Attributing Characters in Rice (Oryza sativa L.) Under Irrigated Conditions of Prayagraj, Uttar Pradesh”
Type of the 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> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Do not use abbreviations unless you spell out and clarify what it stands for.</b> <b>There are 18 references, but no citations located in the paper. This is a bad omission and needs to be corrected as soon as possible.</b> <b>The introduction is too short. There isn't even material related to genetic research concerning rice. Expand this section and include citations.</b> <b>There is hardly any explanation of the statistical analyses used in the paper. This is unacceptable. Write a more detailed “Materials and Methods” section addressing the statistical methods and software used along with location coordinates of the experimental site.</b> <b>Place emphasis on the need for further research needed in the “Conclusion”.</b> <b>Grammatical issues throughout the paper need to be corrected.</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	I would look at formatting the tables differently. Look at the journal template for suggestions.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The lack of a description of the statistical analyses used is a major error. Also, the lack of citations in the text is a major error as well. I would've hoped that this author's advisor or mentor would've been able to assist more in these areas. With major revisions, this could be accepted.	

### 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)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	James Burke
Department, University & Country	University of Arkansas, United States of America