

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_CJAST_98995</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Exploitation of genetic variability and trait association analysis for diverse quantitative traits in bread wheat (<i>Triticum aestivum</i> L.)</b>
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:

(<https://www.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy> )

## Review Form 1.7

### 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have a suggestion for additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, the manuscript is of scientific and practical value. It tries to present how the differentiation between different types of bread wheat (in the environment of the author's country) and this is required to improve productivity and food security.</p> <p>2. Yes, it is suitable but the title must be defined by adding the defining article (the) to become "The Exploitation of Genetic Variability and Trait Association Analysis for Diverse Quantitative Traits in Bread Wheat (<i>Triticum aestivum</i> L.)"</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract is very good and comprehensive. Unless requested by the journal, the abstract should be shortened to 200-250 words.</p> <p>4. No, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are inappropriate. Unless the journal has directives Paper Submission Guide, it is preferable to reclassify the manuscript sections as follows:</p> <p><b>Title</b> <b>Abstract</b> <b>Keywords (3 to 5)</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Introduction</li> <li>2. Literature Review</li> <li>3. Methodology and Data</li> <li>4. Results</li> <li>5. Discussion</li> <li>6. Conclusion</li> </ol> <p><b>References</b></p> <p>5. Yes, from the methodological point of view, the author used appropriate tests to find a correlation (variance-covariance test) between the experiments he conducted to arrive at a recommended sample of wheat. The author bears alone in the sincerity of his experiences in practical application.</p> <p>6. The author used sufficient and update references, which amounted to 77 references.</p> <p>7. When you prepare the literature review, it would be best if you made connections between empirical studies, highlighting the main topics and methodological issues discussed, similarities, differences, and gaps the paper may want to fill.</p> <p>8. Notes on the list of references:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some references are incomplete, such as references Nos. 5 and 6.</li> <li>• The method of writing references does not meet the American APA style.</li> <li>• Check that all the references mentioned in the list of references are used in the text and vice versa.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	The article needs to be proofread.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Omer Allagabo Omer Mustafa
Department, University & Country	Sudan Academy for Banking and Financial Studies, Sudan