



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_51320
Title of the Manuscript:	Genetic Divergence and Heritability Study of Some NERICA Mutant Lines and Their Parents Using Microsatellites Marker and Morphological Traits
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	<p>This work is very good and very important for rice improvement. The comments have included in the revised manuscript.</p> <p>The title(Genetic Divergence and Heritability Study of Some NERICA Mutant Lines and Their Parents Using Microsatellites Marker and Morphological Traits) should be (Genetic Divergence and Heritability Study of Some NERICA Mutant Lines and Their Parents Using Microsatellites Marker and Morphological Traits in Rice).</p> <p>Eighteen advanced early maturing drought tolerant NERICA rice mutant lines (250, 300 and 350 Gy gamma-ray treated) were selected from M4 to M5 generations along with 3 NERICA parent varieties- NERICA-1, NERICA-4 and NERICA-10 (Table.1) and were evaluated to study morphological and molecular variability. The question here is why the among three doses of gamma rays and between M4 and M5 have not been compared at least in terms of mean performances.</p> <p>Genotypic variances (σ^2g), environmental variances (σ^2e), phenotypic variances (σ^2p), genotypic coefficient of variation (GCV) and phenotypic coefficient of variation (PCV) were estimated following the formulas not proposed by Singh and Chaundry (1985), but these formulas as outlined by by Singh and Chaundry (1985).</p> <p>Each formula of genetic parameters should be mentioned separately with the author who proposed it.</p> <p>Mention the author without year.</p> <p>These results need to more discussion.</p>	<p>Authors thank the review for appreciation our work.</p> <p>Title have been corrected accordingly.</p> <p>We would like to respectfully inform you that, in our experiment our aim was to find out most desirable mutant lines for future breeding programme, not find out which dose of mutagen was more effective as we used pre-treated (γ ray) seeds. So we did not find it necessary to compare among three doses of gamma rays and between M4 and M5.</p> <p>Used formulas are accordingly cited as per suggestion and discussion is added where necessary.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		Thank you very much for giving your valuable time to review our paper.

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>	