

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_119987
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploring genetic variability for yield and its attributing traits in rice ( <i>Oryza sativa</i> L.) under low soil phosphorous condition
Type of the Article	Original Research Paper

### 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. This finding is important for breeders consumption to improve genetic potential of rice and other cereal crops under low P condition</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. Yes, but needs minor correction</p> <p>4. Yes</p> <p>5. This finding is scientifically sounded, but it has some limitations which needs correction for e.g.,:  <b>Introduction:</b> Poor defined or justification of research gaps, rather it well proposed solution.  <b>Materials and Methods:</b> the statistical tools used for data analysis is not clearly described; R or Piton are the appropriate tools/software.  <b>Result and discussion:</b> the result for yield in genetic variability is exaggerated because of too small sample taken during experimentation and analysis ( i.e., yield per single plant), which could make bias when it converts to large number of population.</p> <p>The results (<b>graphs</b> and <b>tables</b>) should be present before references week discussion</p> <p>7. it is better to use latest reference, no more than 10 years</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Fair</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Pearson's Correlation analysis for tested traits should be included to discuss the relationship among them</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Lemma Diriba Gurmessa</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural Research, Ethiopia</b>