

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_92154
Title of the Manuscript:	Study of Variability parameters in rice (<i>Oryza sativa</i> L.) genotypes for yield and its attributing traits.
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.journalcjust.com/index.php/CJAST/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- Title is not appropriate! It should be reformulated as follow: Analysis of rice (<i>Oryza sativa</i> L.) accessions genetic variability related to yield and its components 2- Introduction does not well develop problematic and contains too old citations (below 2000!). 3- Statical analyses are vague, their application conditions and significance are obscure! More over means square are used instead of F and P-values! 4- Results are poorly exploited, which compromises their discussion 	
Minor REVISION comments	1- Insert recent authors and give the meaning of the abbreviations then specify the ANOVA significance below tables	
Optional/General comments	Although its title is not suitable and the problematic poorly defined, the results of this study are generally good. However, the poor statistical analysis and the incorrect use of these results did not allow the different discussions to be carried out. Moreover, the conclusion did not answer the problematic by failing to answer the variability linked to the analyzed traits, subject of this study. If all those concerns are taken into account, then the document 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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Koffi Bertin Yao
Department, University & Country	Université Nangui Abrogoua, Côte d'Ivoire