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	**The authors conduct study on the screening and evaluating drought tolerant rapeseed genotypes for Pakistan environment, which is the first step for the breeding of drought tolerant new varieties, and therefore is of importance. However, there are some points needed revised in the manuscript.** **1. 'Association Studies' in title is misleading, just use 'correlation analyses.** **2. 'T0=normal' is not accurate, and should be expressed as '0% PEG'. The molecular weight of PEG should be added, such as PEG6000 or PEG8000.** **3. Reference in Introduction section is not correctly cited. Moreover, second paragraph should be deleted or rephrased.** **4. The drought treatment in the field is not clearly described. Watering PEG solution in the field? For the statistics, the key formula should be listed.** **5. There are two many tables, and none have been cited in the main text. I suggest the authors only present the most informative tables and the others go into supplementary files. There are should be a table ranking the ten genotypes under normal and stress conditions for the most important traits such as seed yield with statistic tested.** **6. The authors claim two ideal tolerant genotypes, but based on what criteria? Please state clearly with supporting data.** **7. In conclusion section, the conclusion should be drowned from your own data, not from references, so don't cite references here.** **8. One genotype,** Punjab Sarsoon, seems to be B. juncea, but not B.napus. please check or modified the expression of sentence.	
Minor REVISION comments	Some sentences are not clearly expressed and not in a scientific way, please improve.	
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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Guangyuan Lu**
Department, University & Country	**Colleage of Life and Food Engineering, Guangdong University of Petrochemical Technology, China**