



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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 Article:	Original

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Aim of the word have to be uniform in abstract and introduction part. It seem like there are two aims in their work; 2) Add reference in the methodology (2.1 and 2.2) part if there is not author's property as in 2.3 part 3) Follow author guideline in the presentation of figures taking the example of figurure where the title position is not respected, as well as the absent of illustration; 4) Authors continue to present methodology in the result part for example in (1)Plant Height (cm): <u>The plant height was refers to the longest distance between the plant base and the tip of the highest leaf (or panicle, whichever is longer) as per the guidelines by UPOV guidelines for rice (34) and Yoshida S.</u> 5) The result presentation does not begin by the ANOVA analysis, but by the finding of author; 6) Author must be uniform an serious. At time it is fig and other time it is figure. What must be take in to consideration?????? 7) Discuss all result with significative difference as in Plant Height , Number of productive tillers/plant, Flag leaf length (cm):..... 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Aim of the manuscript was changed in the introduction part (page no: 2). 2. We thank the Reviewer for the comment. References was added in the methodology section 2.1 (Ref; Mohapatra et al 2014, page no: 2) and 2.2 section (Ref: Zhan, Chengfang et.al. 2019; and Zhao, C. F., et al.2019, page no: 3). 3. Figures in the manuscript were presented at respective places, according to authors guidelines (page no: 4 to 9) and new figures were added to the content (Fig: D, E &F, page no: 6&7) to remove the confusion and to clear the illustration in the manuscript. 4. We thank the Reviewer for bringing this point to our attention. We have included methodology for all traits supported by respective references in concise manner to remove the confusion (in 2.3 sections, page no: 3). 5. The presentation of results was rewritten and more information was included before ANOVA analysis, in the manuscript to remove the confusion (page no: 4). 6. We thank the Reviewer for the comment. We modified the content in the manuscript according to author guidelines. Please take word Figure in the consideration. 7. All the results were discussed thoroughly in the manuscript with significance difference (page no: 4 to 9).