

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_126275
Title of the Manuscript:	Genetic diversity analysis of rice (<i>Oryza sativa</i> L.) genotypes for yield and sheath blight resistance
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>Good for varietal development. Clusters were formed due to broad genetic variability among the genotypes where clusters didn't explained by sheath blight resistance. Cluster- I could be selected for developing HYVs which might not reflect ShB resistance. If Clusters are made by disease related data than could suggest genotypes for disease resistance programs. Clusters formed due to varietal differences instead of differences caused by <i>R. solani</i> infection. Dendrogram could be explained by varietal characters rather than sheath blight infection. Yield contributing traits were desirable in Cluster I due to varietal contributions. Only RLH, PDI and NLS could explain the Cluster.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Title is nice if author add some more data on sheath blight resistance.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>Abstract is little bit comprehensive. Some disease related data are needed.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>May be okay</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>Not scientifically robust. Not technically sound.</p> <p>The differences in TGW and GY could be due to varietal choice. All other characters also differed due to varietal causes. Here, Sheath blight disease might have little effect in the differences on characters to form clusters.</p> <p>Author must put more sheath blight disease related data to select genotype for disease resistance program.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>-</p>	<p>Need more ShB resistance related references</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Could be nice</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Author(s) must meet or address the lacking mentioned in the reviewer from and on the manuscript.</p>	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with the reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in detail)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohammad Hossain
Department, University & Country	Bangladesh Rice Research Institute, Bangladesh