

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 (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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The centre line of the manuscript is based on iron content of wheat which is an important micro-nutrient as 25% of the world population suffers from anaemia. But in the manuscript, nothing has been explained clearly about how the findings are relevant to scientific community. The introduction part needs major revision as nothing has been mentioned about micronutrient iron. It is just a normal wheat introduction. I also recommend author to improve the discussion part of the paper by discussing results with their inferences citing relevant literature</p> <p>The title "FEATURE OF IRON ACCUMULATION IN THE GRAIN OF SOFT WHEAT BELONGING TO DIFFERENT ECOLOGICAL AND GEOGRAPHICAL REGIONS" is not suitable as it is not in the context with the content written in the manuscript. The alternative title could be "STUDIES ON THE POTENTIAL OF IRON CONCENTRATED SOFT WHEAT GENOTYPES ORIGINATING FROM DIFFERENT ECOLOGICAL REGIONS OF UZBEKISTAN/WORLD"</p> <p>The abstract needs serious modifications. In abstract brief the aim of study, drawbacks of the previous study & the advantages of the proposed study. Also add one or two sentences about challenges of the study and later discuss about the contributions made</p> <p>Concentrate on improvement in terms of grammar, spellings, and presentations. The paper needs careful English polishing since there are many typos and poorly written sentences.</p> <p>Although the manuscript is made on an important topic but it needs comprehensive revision to be accepted as a research paper. The results and discussion part needs to be elaborative and it is seriously recommended to improve the discussion part of the paper by discussing results with their inferences citing relevant literature</p> <p>The references are not enough. The results need to be supported with suitable and updated references in discussion. Add references from papers published in the journals related with your research.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Concentrate on improvement in terms of grammar, spellings, and presentations. The paper needs careful English polishing since there are many poorly written sentences.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript needs a major revision to be accepted as a research paper. Abstract and introduction part needs major revision. The review of literature needs to be corrected and the results and discussion part are not explaining clearly how this study will be helpful for scientific community. Overall, the whole paper needs major revision to be accepted as a research paper. Support your results with suitable and updated references in discussion. Brief the aim of study, drawbacks of the previous study & the advantages of the proposed study in one quoted line and enrich review of literature part in introduction with updated data.</p>	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Priyanka
Department, University & Country	Chaudhary Saran Kumar Himachal Pradesh Krishi Vishwavidyalya, India