



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_29059
Title of the Manuscript:	Screening of Disease Resistant Varieties against Brown Leaf Spot Disease of Paddy
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:

(<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 (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	➤ Title modified: Screening of Rice Varieties against Brown Leaf Spot Disease of Rice (The earlier title does not reflect the correct meaning because authors says that screening of disease resistant varieties; if disease resistance is already exit then why need of this study?) ➤ Abstract modified: Brown leaf spot disease of rice is the most serious disease of rice worldwide. Twenty five rice varieties were screening against brown leaf spot caused by <i>Helminthosporium oryzae</i> during <i>kharif</i> season 2014 and 2015. The results showed that four varieties viz. NDR-359, CR 1, CR 2, N-18 were highly resistant. Seven varieties viz. PR-103, IR-36, Prasd, Narendra-2, IR-597, OC-1339, Cross-116 were recorded as resistant while six varieties viz. IET-849, Pusa NR-381, Narendra-80, Narendra Dhan-97, Jalnidhi, Jallahari as moderately resistant. Three varieties viz. Rupali, MTU-7029, Sweta were moderately susceptible while IET-2969 and Annapurna were susceptible. Three varieties viz. Nagina-22, CR-126, Cauvery were recorded as highly susceptible in all three screening condition i.e. laboratory, pot and field. In view of present investigation, it provides use full information to the farmers by which they can use these varieties which are resistant to brown leaf spot disease of rice. This	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	may increase the productivity and save the economy of farmers. ➤ Throughout study authors somewhere used term Paddy and somewhere Rice. It is clearly used only one term throughout study. ➤ Page 1 & Line 5: Give the name of season i.e. kharif or Rabi in which study was performed. ➤ Page 1 & Line 30-33: Sentence incomplete and does not reflect correct meaning (havoc???) ➤ Page 2 & Line 52-53: Sentence does not reflect correct meaning ➤ Page 2 & Line 63-64: Do not use term I. ➤ Page 2 & Line 70 & 74: Authors said that 25 varieties were used in this study, then here said that 25 varieties were selected in pot and field condition, then how many varieties were planted in pot and field conditions? Sentences do not reflect true meaning, correct it. ➤ Page 2 & Line 81-82: (Junaid A.K. 2000). Does not write A.K. here. ➤ Page 3 & Line 82: Give the title of table and No. In this table if score will come as 10.5, 20.5 etc. then what authors do? Explain clearly. Correct it by using symbol < & > ➤ Page 3 & Line 88-94: Sentence does not reflect correct meaning. Reform sentences. ➤ Table 1 & 4; Table 2 & 5; Table 3 & 6. Merge in one table. By this way table give true reflection and easily compare results. ➤ Result: In result section authors do not discuss the	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	result year wise and not discuss about table 1-6. Discuss result year wise with % of DI. OR Combine the section result and Discussion ➤ Page 13 & Line 264: Check spelling of Chuahan or Chauhan ➤ Give a sentence of Conclusion ➤ Reference: Author does not follow same pattern of writing reference in text as well reference section both. Correct it. ➤ Alam et al (2014); Hossain and Kulkarni (2001); Bonman (1992); Nagaraju et al (1991); Saifullan et al (1991) NOT cited in reference section but cited in text. ➤ Prabhu et al (1996) cited in Reference section but not cited in text. ➤ Discussion is most important section of the paper. Presently discussion section is not attractive/ weaker due to absence of references and proper explanation. Here author justify and correlate his results to other authors worked in same direction. Here, author give results continuously without discussing his results with already published results, and give some reference with results in separate paragraph which give no meaning discussion in this study.	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	➤ In the present study author screen only 25 rice varieties which are very less in number. Here author explain that on which basis or criteria he selected only 25 rice varieties. In this study author select these varieties from Allahabad district of U.P. India, why they choose only one district not other nearer district. If they selected one district Allahabad then in this district only 25 rice varieties were grown or more than that grown, if more than that grown then why author select these 25 varieties.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	➤ Page 3 & Line 87: Used term present in place of current	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anil Kumar Singh
Department, University & Country	Department of Genetics and Plant Breeding, Instt. of Ag. Sc., B.H.U., Varanasi, U.P. India