

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural and Horticultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAHR_102157
Title of the Manuscript:	COMBINING ABILITIES OF BREAD WHEAT (<i>Triticum aestivum</i> L.) VARIETY FOR THE SOUTHERN REGIONS OF THE REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN
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/AJAHR/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)
<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><i>The manuscript is important for scientific community.</i></p> <p><i>The title of the article is suitable.</i></p> <p><i>Revise the abstract to make it easier, clearer and simple to understand appreciation of experiment and its results.</i></p> <p><i>The manuscript should consider including subsections on (1) Rationale and Objectives of the Study, (2) Summary of the Discussions and (3) Recommendations.</i></p> <p><i>The article is scientifically correct.</i></p> <p><i>Additional comments and suggestions as sidenotes indicated in the main article.</i></p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p><i>The use of English language is suitable for scholarly communications</i></p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Renato L. Lapitan
Department, University & Country	Institute of Renewable Natural Resources, University of the Philippines Los Banos, Philippines