

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_96438
Title of the Manuscript:	Response of cotton genotypes to water-deficit stress using drought tolerance indices and principal component analysis
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:

(<https://www.journalajaar.com/index.php/AJAAR/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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. If it is important, it properly uses the analytical elements to make the inferences, and it is an issue of great importance in regions where there is a high water deficit in cotton production. 2. Yes. 3. The abstract must be improved, order it better. 4. Yes. 5. It has some suggestions and notation errors that need to be corrected, but its publication is highly suggested if the observations are corrected. 6. Yes	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, but I think it could be improved it.	
Optional/General comments	They observe that there is a perfect correlation, which in the real world is almost impossible for it to happen, in this case it is very rare that it has happened, it should be checked carefully, unless one measure is effectively equivalent to the other. It would be better if they showed it analytically and not visually, the quality of the graph does not allow it to be validated.	

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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ernesto Cervantes López
Department, University & Country	National Institute of Statistic and Geography, México