



Name:	<a href="#">UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_3447
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Studies on Screening and Inheritance of yellow stem borer (<i>Scirpophaga incertulas</i> Walker) resistance in F2 and F3 segregating generations of rice (<i>Oryza sativa</i> L.)</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**General guideline:**

**This journal believes that no manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of ‘lack of Novelty’**, provided the manuscript is sufficiently robust and technically sound. Too often a journal's decision to publish a paper is dominated by what the Editor/reviewer think is interesting and will gain greater readership - both of which are subjective judgments and lead to decisions which are frustrating and delay the publication. This journal will rigorously peer-review your submissions and publish all papers that are judged to be technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<http://mbimph.com/index.php/UPJOZ/editorial-policy>



## 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's feedback
<p><b><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</b></p> <p><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b></p> <p>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p>	<p>1. Yes. I agree that the manuscript is important for scientific community. Besides some minor corrections on the citation-reference problem (see my feedback in the manuscript draft), the manuscript's grammar is literally enjoyable. The contents can also contribute to science, especially to plant breeding.</p> <p>Actually I also appreciate the use of chi-square formula (calculated <math>\chi^2</math>) for testing the goodness of fit of resistant:susceptible ratio therein. But in the Method section the author(s) did not explain how to draw the conclusion using those <math>\chi^2</math> values; as a result, confusions and mis-interpretation happened in the Results &amp; Discussion section; namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the author(s) mis-put significant marks (* or **) on the critical values of <math>\chi^2</math> (not on the calculated values of <math>\chi^2</math>).</li> <li>• Non-significant marks (<sup>ns</sup>) were not found anywhere in the manuscript despite the fact that all calculated values of <math>\chi^2</math> are NOT significant (see Table 3).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Thank you for your insightful feedback on our manuscript. We appreciate the opportunity to revise and improve our work.</li> <li>➤ The title of the article was changed as per reviewer comment</li> <li>➤ We agree with the reviewer's assessment. We have revised the entire manuscript as per reviewer's comments</li> <li>➤ New detailed explanation are added to manuscript as per reviewers comments on Chi square calculation</li> <li>➤ The citation-reference problem is rectified</li> <li>➤ The Table 3 is maintained as per our submitted thesis format to Annamalai University</li> <li>➤ Non-significant marks (<sup>ns</sup>) were added to table 3.</li> <li>➤ New plate was added.</li> </ul>
<p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b></p> <p>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>2. Yes. But please see my suggestions in the manuscript draft.</p>	

<p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>3. Yes.</p> <p>4. Yes. But please see my suggestions in the Method section and in the Results &amp; Discussion section. Null hypotheses about 9:7 ratio (resistant:susceptible) need to be stated in the Methods section. Alternatively, please add at least two sentences in the Methods section describing how to draw conclusions based on the significance or non-significance of the computed values of <math>\chi^2</math>.</p> <p>5. Yes, except the contents in Table 3. Please check Table 3 and see my suggestions therein.</p> <p>6. Yes. But please check-and-recheck the reference-citation consistency.</p>	
--	--	--



<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	No