

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_126205
Title of the Manuscript:	Generation Mean Analysis in Physiomorphic Traits of Aerobic Rice
Type of the Article	Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>  
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is so informative and valuable for the research community, particularly for those involved in hybridization crop breeding program. I like most of the explanations regarding the significant values of the experiment due to the researcher discussion approach to the point of interest. To make it more informative, it is better to have an additional figurative description of the methodologies. For instance the “ LinexTester” crossing design .	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It is suitable, but it needs some sort of “rephrasing” to make it more informative.  It should be more informative. Its specific implementation area and country.  For-instance: Generation Mean Analysis in Physio-morphic Traits of Aerobic Rice in Assam, India.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	It is almost comprehensive. However, it needs some sort of corrections ( addition and deletion of points).  It is good if it is possible to strength your finding with other similar research findings.  Commonly use similar terms in all bodies of your manuscript. Example: “Panicl harvest index” or “Harvest index” has been used differently in different parts of the manuscript.  It is better indicate the software used to compute the analysis of variance among different generations of the selected crosses.  It is better to indicate the aim of the experiment prior to its specific objective.  Generally, some sort of deletion and addition of ideas have been commented on the body of the manuscript.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	It is better to add “recommendation” separately below the conclusion part.  Introduction or Background and Justification, Materials and Methods, Results and Discussion, Conclusion, Recommendation, References, Appendix (If needed).	

Review Form 3

Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	It is better to discuss the key components of mean generation analysis separately giving each a subsection. That is, the additive genetic effects, dominance genetic effects including the epistasis effects, and genetic variance across the different aerobic rice crossing generations (Parents P1 and P2, F1, F2, B1, and B2) so as to evaluate the significant genetic influences on various Physio-morphic traits of the generation. Give a different subsection to each component, and have a separate discussion for each.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Most of the references are not recent. Use recent citation (the current 5 years)	
Minor REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It is OK and enough	
Optional/General comments	Generally, the manuscript is interesting and informative. However, it needs some sort of revision, particularly under its abstract, introduction and conclusion parts  Under the abstract, the software used for analysis should be specified.  Under its introductory part, the aim and purpose of the manuscript should be clearly identified and indicated.  It is better to put the conclusion and recommendation separately. Otherwise the sub title should be rephrased as “Conclusion and Recommendation”	.

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Gedifew Gebrie Muchie
Department, University & Country	Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural Research, Ethiopia