

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

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name: | Seied Mehdi Miri |
| Department, University & Country | Islamic Azad University-Karaj Branch, Iran |