

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_95048
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Mean Performance, Variability, Traits Association and Path Coefficient in Transplanted Aman Rice (<i>Oryza sativa</i> L.) Landraces
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.journalajob.com/index.php/AJOB/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)	<p>The manuscript holds the merits to be disseminated among the rice breeders and scientific community. The manuscript is well written and well explained. Every section is written in balanced style.</p> <p>The title is suitable, and requires no revision.</p> <p>The abstract is well written and comprehensive.</p> <p>Every subsection is written in a balanced way that meet the standards of a scientific manuscript. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically sound.</p> <p>I would like to suggest that add some more references especially in the discussion section. To correlate more literature with your findings.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript is well written. However, thoroughly check the typos.	
Optional/General comments	1. Add a proper discussion in the results subsection 3.1 and so on. 2. Add a paragraph in the discussion about the previous research related to germplasm evaluation. So that readers get the point of your research.	

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:	Ahmad Ali
Department, University & Country	College of Plant Sciences & Technology, Huazhong Agricultural University, Pakistan