

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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. Yes, because to explore the possibilities of drought-tolerant crops is a time requirement for all terrestrial crop species. The manuscript is important in the context of climate change 2. The title is correct 3. The abstract is understandable 4. The sections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate 5. From my point of view the manuscript is scientifically correct 6. References are sufficient and current	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	I think the quality of the article's language/English is adequate	
Optional/General comments	Remove yellow highlight	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nau Silverio Niño Gutiérrez
Department, University & Country	Autonomous University of Guerrero, Mexico