



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>International Journal of Plant & Soil Science</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_31046
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance Evaluation of Some Selected Wheat (<i>Triticum aestivum</i> L.) Genotypes
Type of the Article	<u>Original Research Article</u>

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	<p>Author need to give rational for choosing the varieties.</p> <p>What is the evidence that wheat varieties are genetically diverse? If not then we can write varieties not genotypes.</p> <p>In the Introduction author need to the % use of the varieties in Bangladesh.</p> <p>Varieties behave differently (positively/negatively) for different application of manures and fertilizers. So provide reference that the applied concentration is optimum for the growth.</p> <p>Justify why not PYT-12 is better. Its parameter are very much comparable to BARI Gom 25/PYT15.</p>	I agree with you sir for all comments that you have mentioned. I have made all the necessary corrections in revised copy of the paper.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Discussion is very weak and more justification is required.	I agree with you sir for all comments that you have mentioned. I have made all the necessary corrections in revised copy of the paper.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		