

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_129304
Title of the Manuscript:	Genetic Diversity Studies in Rice (Oryza sativa L.) Genotypes
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3
PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript addresses a critical aspect of crop improvement by evaluating genetic diversity in rice genotypes using multivariate and cluster analysis. It provides valuable insights for selecting superior parents for hybridization programs, which is essential for enhancing rice productivity. The findings are relevant for the scientific community, particularly in regions with low rice productivity, such as the Western Ghats agro-climatic zone.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Ok	
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.	- Provides a concise overview of the objectives, methods, and key findings. - Highlights the importance of inter-cluster distances for hybridization. Suggestions for Improvement: - Add specific numerical results for key findings, such as the range of genetic divergence values. - Clarify the relevance of traits like test weight and flag leaf length in the abstract.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	- The use of Mahalanobis D² statistics and Tocher’s clustering method is appropriate and well-documented. - Results are statistically supported, with clear implications for breeding programs. Suggestions for Improvement: - Discuss the limitations of the study, such as environmental factors influencing trait expression. - Include a brief explanation of why specific traits like plant height and flag leaf breadth showed lower contributions to divergence.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Include more recent studies to strengthen the literature review.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Ok.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	- The manuscript could benefit from a discussion on how findings align with or differ from other studies in the same agro-climatic zone. - Consider adding a graphical abstract or summary table to visually highlight key findings.	

PART 2:

Review Form 3

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s comment (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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in detail) No	
Are there competing interest issues in this manuscript?	No	
If plagiarism is suspected, please provide related proofs or web links.	---	

PART 3: Declaration of Competing Interest of the Reviewer: I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer

Here reviewer should declare his/her competing interest. If nothing to declare he/she can write “I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer”

PART 4: Objective Evaluation:

Guideline	MARKS of this manuscript
Give OVERALL MARKS you want to give to this manuscript (Highest: 10 Lowest: 0) Guideline: Accept As It Is: (>9-10) Minor Revision: (>8-9) Major Revision: (>7-8) Serious Major revision: (>5-7) Rejected (with repairable deficiencies and may be reconsidered): (>3-5) Strongly rejected (with irreparable deficiencies.): (>0-3)	8.2

Review Form 3
Editorial Comments (This section is reserved for the comments from journal editorial office and editors):

	Author's Feedback

Reviewer Details:
This section is mandatory to prepare the Reviewer Certificate.
Please complete this section carefully. Reviewer Certificate will be generated by using this information only.
Your Certificate will be wrong, if you provide incorrect information.
Please note modification of certificate will not be possible after generation.
Certificate will not be issued if incomplete information is provided.

Name of the Reviewer	Dr. T. Sabesan
Department of Reviewer	Genetics and Plant Breeding
University or Institution of Reviewer	Annamalai University
Country of Reviewer	India
Position: (Professor/lecturer, etc.) of Reviewer	Professor
Email ID of Reviewer	sabavani@gmail.com
WhatsApp Number of Reviewer (Optional)	
Write 5-8 Keywords regarding expertise of Reviewer	Abiotic stress, host plant resistance, rice, pulses