

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_85599
Title of the Manuscript:	Estimating Genetic Variability and Diversity for Vein Density, Photosynthesis and Yield in Rice Genotypes
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://www.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy>)

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	Some revisions need to be made in the manuscript. The abstract section needs to be reviewed, as to show the importance, problems, or relevance of the issue assessed in the article (as outlined in the introduction). The abstract should be structured as a micro version of the paper. Some of the statistics and methods used, which were cited in 'results and discussion', need to be better explaining in 'materials and methods'	Thank you for your valuable comments sir/ madam. I have followed all the suggestions and corrected the manuscript. Also I have included the formulas for genetic parameters in materials and methods.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	There is no comment regarding minor revision.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The relevance of this paper is related to the applicability of the data provided to the rice breeding process. However, it is necessary to emphasize the significance of the result obtained. In other words, to demonstrate how these clusters could be useful for plant breeders and crop improvement (especially in the conclusion section) in view of the new information provided by this scientific article.	

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>	