

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Botany
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIB_85607
Title of the Manuscript:	Character Association Studies in Various Brassica Napus Genotypes under Drought Stress
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:

(<https://journalajrib.com/index.php/AJRIB/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<div>1. The manuscript must be edited by an English language editor.</div> <div>2. The manuscript strongly needs to be revised by experts to become a manuscript of a research paper.</div> <div>3. The abstract should not exceed 300 words in length.</div> <div>4. Plant materials as accession, variety and genotype are given in different parts of the manuscript. Which one is correct?</div> <div>5. In the first line of the Introduction, replace “Brassica” with “Rapeseed” (as well as in other parts of the manuscript).</div> <div>6. Parts of the text of the manuscript are not referenced (including the first two paragraphs of the Introduction).</div> <div>7. In Materials and Methods, the method of performing the two experiments and applying the treatments is not clear, and how to apply the drought treatments is not stated at all!</div> <div>8. Mean comparison between genotypes should be performed for traits that became significant.</div> <div>9. 9 of the 11 tables are not mentioned in the text.</div> <div>10.Tables need revisions. For example in Table 1:<div>“Genotype” should be written instead of “Mean square”.</div><div>The minimum and maximum range requires a unit.</div><div>Significance levels * and ** must be specified in the table subtitle.</div><div>Mean squares of traits that were not significant should be specified with “ns”.</div></div> <div>11.The discussion is very poorly written.</div> <div>12.It is written in section 3.1: "Dry shoot weight was highly significant and positive correlated with FSW(r=0.019), (r=0.262)", whilst the higher the coefficient (close to 1), the stronger the correlation.</div> <div>13.Conclusion should briefly state the major findings of the study.</div> <div>14.The references used are very old (14 of the 15 are from more than 20 years ago).</div>	<div>All the suggestions of reviewer are considered. All the mistakes have been corrected. The recommendations by reviewers are very appreciable. It has helped a lot in improving this manuscript.</div>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General 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?	<div>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</div>	