

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural and Horticultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAHR_79358
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Genetic Diversity for yield and yield-related traits in Rice (Oryza sativa L.) using Mahalanobis' D2
Type of the 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:

(<https://www.journalajahr.com/index.php/AJAHR/editorial-policy>)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>1. On page 4, there is written ``The examination of variation for all the characters showed fair variations between the genotypes under study, suggesting the existence of appropriate heterogeneity.'' Were the significant differences fined? If yes, what test did you use? If not, there should be written that this claim is stated only based on the values of GAM, etc.</p> <p>2. If I understand correctly, the 112 genotypes were divided into seven groups using the cluster analysis based on the Mahalanobis statistic. However, there is no further word about the method of cluster analysis. Was it a hierarchical analysis? What method of connecting the cluster? Were other distances considered? Why Mahalanobis distance was used? Why the number of clusters is seven?</p> <p>3. In Table 4, the means are presented. Are there significant differences between them?</p> <p>4. In the paper, there are some recommendations for improving rice production. It would be nice to check this practically. Namely, the experiment could be conducted to see if the application of recommendation gives greater yields. This would be something very interesting. However, perhaps this is too expensive.</p>	Modified as suggestion
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>1. The summary of the paper is appreciated.</p> <p>2. The header of Table 5 is on page 10, while this table is on page 11.</p>	Corrected
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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