

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_96484
Title of the Manuscript:	CLUSTER ANALYSIS OF RICE (Oryza sativa L.) MUTANT LINES OF USING MORPHOLOGICAL PARAMETERS
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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/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)	The work has developed few potential mutant lines which could be useful in the future breeding programme. Suitable Needs few modification, few lines of results could be further added The morphological data given in the methods session were not described in the result part. The variability table and the morphological data table and the explanation could be possibly added to improve the quality of the manuscript Yes The result and discussion have to be modified to improve the manuscript, the recent references could be added to substantiate the results	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Needs improvement	
Optional/General comments	Results and discussion needs full modification	

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:	K. Baghyalakshmi
Department, University & Country	ICAR, CICR, India