



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJPSS_12828
Title of the Manuscript:	PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND GENETICS OF EXOTIC RICE VARIETIES IN A NIGERIA AGRO-ECOLOGY
Type of the 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I think the title of the manuscripts is not suitable (performance evaluation and genetics.....) for example you can change to (Variability, heritability, genetic advance and path coefficient studies of some agronomic characters of exotic rice varieties in a Nigeria agro-ecology). 2. In line 50 the statement is not clear i understand from this statement that you do this experiment in different environment of tropical africa but i think that this experiment was done in only one placeand only one year which is not enough to explain relationship between yield and yield components and path analysis. 3. What is the reason for obtaining the varieties from Malaysian In short we learn very little about the plants or whether they could be useful. 	The title had been changed to Genetic variability and performance evaluation of exotic rice varieties in a Nigeria agro-ecology.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>4. A number of the terms used are never defined and not clear to someone unfamiliar with for example in line 158 the statement is not clear or could not be understand.</p> <p>5. The author must grow the local check varieties and make a comparison between the exotic varieties and local varieties to compare the performance of local varieties with exotic varieties.</p> <p>6. In line 91 the author said that the plant heights of the genotypes were somehow short statured compare to the parental types. I can't see the value of the parental types . So you can't add this statement if you don't grow the parental type with the exotic varieties to make comparison.</p> <p>7. The author make a result about plant height, number of tillers/hill, number of productive tillers i.e. effective tiller with panicle (ETP), tiller without panicle, flag leaf length, panicle length. What about panicle weight, number of filled grains/panicle, number of unfilled grains/panicle, 1000_grain weight, grain length, grain width.</p> <p>8. Several genetic parameters were estimated like GCV, PCV, h^2B, GAM and GA but only GA and h^2B were discussed in the manuscript.</p> <p>9. The English is poor, and sometimes hard to</p>	<p>The statement had been reconstructed and the parental types removed.</p>
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	understand so english should be checked by native speaker. 10. revision is necessary.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		