



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_56469
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Agro-Morphological characters among complete panicle emergence mutants of Samba Mahsuri (BPT-5204)
Type of the Article	Original

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>)

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>Paper badly present, Absence of reference in methodology, Result was not well present, authors must firstly present what the found before the presentation of ANOVA data. Read more articles for the discussion Follow author guideline</p>	<p>1. We thank the Reviewer for the insight. We rechecked the manuscript and corrections made in the manuscript.</p> <p>2. Reference was added to the methodology section. EX: Reference: UPOV guidelines for rice (36) & Yoshida S.(40) (page 3).</p> <p>3. The main argument of the paper is to identify the CPE mutants and assessment of morphological characters of CPE mutants and their correlation analysis. We are edited the results in the manuscript to remove the confusion.</p> <p>4. In the discussion section of the paper we have added how the findings connected to the content of the paper .We have rewritten this section to remove the confusion. The content in the discussion section was supported with more recent references.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Figure and result are badly present,</p>	<p>We thank the Reviewer for the comment. The results section has been rewritten to remove the confusion and details have been added in the results section. Figure :a was changed in the manuscript.</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>Authors must rewrite his paper according to author's guideline.</p>	<p>Rewritten according to authors guideline.</p>



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

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