

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural and Horticultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJHR_103943
Title of the Manuscript:	FEATURE OF IRON ACCUMULATION IN THE GRAIN OF SOFT WHEAT BELONGING TO DIFFERENT ECOLOGICAL AND GEOGRAPHICAL REGIONS
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.journalajahr.com/index.php/AJHR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This manuscript is important to the scientific community as it explores wheat genotypes for beneficial economic traits and high grain quality, focusing on iron content. The identification of early-ripening wheat varieties with enhanced yield, quality, and iron content can guide breeding programs and improve food security and health. It contributes to our understanding of wheat genetic diversity and crop improvement efforts. 2. The current title of the article lacks clarity about the specific focus of the study. A more suitable title might be "Evaluating Genetic Variability and Biometric Indicators in Soft Wheat Varieties: Implications for Modern Selection Methods" to better reflect the manuscript's content. 3. The abstract is generally clear and describes the overall research objectives. However, it doesn't sufficiently highlight the main findings, such as the iron content in different wheat varieties as per its title. Having more clearly written objective would be helpful for readers. The original title related to iron accumulation is not included in the abstract. The abstract could be further improved by emphasizing key results for more clarity and impact. 4. The manuscript is well-structured with clear subsections such as Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results, and Conclusion. However, the Materials and Methods section needs more details for clarity and replicability of the study. The Results section could also benefit from a more concise presentation of data and clearer articulation of key findings. A consistent formatting should be used for each heading. 5. The manuscript appears scientifically sound based on the information provided, but without more specific details about the methodologies and data analysis, it is difficult to fully assess its scientific correctness. 6. The references are mainly relevant and recent. However, the author might consider adding more references to recent studies focusing on the same crop and variables to better contextualize their findings in the broader field of research. Additionally, references to studies focusing on the specific wheat varieties under consideration would also add value to the paper. 	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language and English quality of the article needs improvement. The phrasing and sentence construction in some parts of the manuscript can be clarified for better readability. Additionally, the use of technical terms needs to be consistent throughout the manuscript. I recommend the authors to proofread the article to improve the overall readability and clarity of the manuscript.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Use appropriate title to reflect the objective and findings of study. Clearly state the objective/findings of research in abstract. Clearly state the objectives of study at the end of introduction. Ensure material and methods covers all topics so a reader can replicate the study. Ensure result section includes valid data points. Use proper tense and make it consistent throughout the paper as needed. Included tables/figures should be properly described in text. Include the in-text references to the list of references.</p> <p><i>Please check the comments on paper for more details.</i></p> <p>Good Luck.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ateet Maharjan
Department, University & Country	Center for Advanced Transportation Technology Lab, University of Maryland, United States