



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_53437
Title of the Manuscript:	Descriptive Statistics and Heritability for Agronomic Traits and Grain Micronutrient Content in Rice (Oryza sativa L.)
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 Type of_Gene action has not been mentioned for concerned traits that having high heritability coupled with high genetic advance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Type of Gene action should be mention in result and discussion. Citation mentioned in results and discussion is not coincide with references. Therefore, it is essential to include proper citation to have fruitful results.	
Minor REVISION comments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	Introduction: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The breeding of micronutrient fortified crops should be deleted. Materials and Methods: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Genotypic Variance (σ^2_g): No. of replications should be replaced with" r" Phenotypic Standard Deviation and mean should be replaced with σ^2_p and X respectively. Genotypic Standard Deviation should be replaced with σ^2_g Results: canopy temperature 22.17 replaced with 22.16 Heritability and Genetic Advance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> plant height (940.54) should replaced with 40.54 grain zinc content (222.64) should replaced with 22.64 % should replaced with percent 	
Optional/General comments	Manuscript is very good , it may be publish	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anuj Kumar Choudhary
Department, University & Country	India