

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_95668
Title of the Manuscript:	Investigation of agro-morphological characters between 34 accessions of <i>Trifolium resupinatum</i> L.
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.journalajaar.com/index.php/AJAAR/editorial-policy>)

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 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1- This manuscript is important for scientific community because it reflects the high biodiversity for this species that could be exploited in genetic improvement of <i>Trifolium resupinatum</i> . 2- The title of the article is suitable, it clearly describes the article. 3- The abstract of the article is comprehensive; it reflects the contents of the article and its findings. 4- The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate and clearly designed. 5- It is scientifically correct. 6- The references are sufficient and recent.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	2. Yes it is suitable for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General 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:	Mohamed Ibrahim Ismail
Department, University & Country	Sudan