



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_36807
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF TRANSPLANTING TIMES ON PHENOLS, ENZYMES, AND CARBOHYDRATES IN RICE GENOTYPES
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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Good research work on the influence of transplanting times on the activities of some enzymes and secondary metabolites found in heat tolerant and heat susceptible rice genotypes. The study had provided baseline information and direction to farmers and mandate institutions on the best transplanting times that will trigger highest activity of the crop defense enzymes and compounds thus harnessing the growth and yield potentials of the genotypes for further exploitation for food security and income generation.	We are thankful to esteemed reviewer's deep study of our manuscript and highlighting the main feature of our study. We are also thankful to reviewer's for helping in improving our manuscript.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The materials and methods sections should be corrected in line with the identified mistakes. The experimental design used was not stated but analysis of variance was used to analyse the data generated. The layout of the experiment was not properly articulated in the manuscript. Please state clearly the number of treatments used, the number of replicates used, the total number of experimental units, the type of experimental design adopted, the inferential analytical tool adopted and the level of probability for which treatments means were considered to be significant. Few other mistakes were identified in the manuscripts and were pointed out using the comment icons. Please authors should effects corrections accordingly. All journal cited should be written out in full and not abbreviated to ease cross referencing.	The materials and methods sections has been in the revised ms corrected as marked. The experimental design has been stated in the revised manuscript. The layout of the experiment has been properly explained. The transplanting times, number of replications has been mentioned in the revised ms. The LSD level has also been written. All the highlighted mistakes have been corrected as per esteemed reviewer's comments. References have been corrected in the revised manuscript.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Good research work.	Thanks for appreciating our study.