



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_37216
Title of the Manuscript:	Drought tolerance of five quinoa (Chinopodium quinoa Willd.) genotypes and its association with other traits under elevated water 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:

(<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 (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		
Minor REVISION comments	The manuscript relates to the effect of drought stress on the properties of different <i>Chenopodium quinoa</i> genotypes. The tolerance ability of five quinoa genotypes was tested. One genotype was selected as the most tolerant. The selection criteria useful for breeders in selection for high drought tolerance were indicated. In my opinion, the title of the manuscript is misleading because it suggests studies under conditions of "elevated water stress" but in the text there is nothing about it. Instead of that the term of "drought stress" is used. Those are of two different meanings. I would suggest to change the title and use the "drought stress" term instead of "elevated water stress". Besides that the paper is interesting. It is provided with clear introduction. Used methods, including statistical analysis, are correct and described good enough to be repeated by another researcher. Obtained results are well presented and discussed with adequate and current literature. Discussion and conclusions are based on presented inside the manuscript data. The manuscript requires the minor correction. Some small mistakes and comments are presented below: Line 10: add plural to be consequent to objective (i) in line 70 Line 15: drought tolerant genotypes Line 16: than the sensitive (S) ones Line 17: delete "< respectively" Line 24-25: please unify first letters of the key words, use all small letters (except <i>Chenopodium</i>) or all capitals Line 31-33: Please indicate if and how the grain is actually used in the practice or the possibilities to use it in the future. Line 36: "than" instead of "to" Line 40: where are the vesicles present, on the roots or leaves? It's not clear Line 51: is useful "in" estimating Line 53: on "a" few Line 53: and "they" are based Line 88: please complete the information on soil type Line 204: the differences result from genetics but the improvement of the traits via genetics is not necessarily possible. Maybe this way would be better: "improvement of these traits is possible only via breeding program"? Line 257: is it registered variety or just genotype or line? Line 258: suffers Line 259: The text starting from line 257 to 279 one does not relate to the title of the manuscript. It is just general knowledge on the species. It should be part of Introduction chapter. Line 383: the heritability of "it" is high	-I agree to change the title as follows: Drought tolerance of five quinoa (<i>Chenopodium quinoa</i> Willd.) genotypes and its association with other traits under moderate and severe drought stress Corrected Corrected Corrected Corrected Corrected Corrected Corrected We can follow the reference Corrected Corrected Corrected Done Corrected It is better to use genotype, because we are not sure. Done It is also here as a part of discussion. Done
Optional/General comments		