

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_109274
Title of the Manuscript:	Agro-Morphological characterization of wheat (<i>Triticum aestivum</i> L.) genotypes
Type of the Article	Original Research article

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract is informative but it does not highlight the results. Abbreviation used in the abstract i.e. DUS should be written in full form. Moreover, keywords should be improved. It is preferable to use 5-6 keywords that are not present in the title.</p> <p>4. The structure of the manuscript is appropriate but "Materials and Methods" section should be revised and more details about experimental conditions (soil characteristics particularly), meteorological conditions (rain and temperature data during the experiment), agronomic practices performed during the experiment etc. should be added.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. In total 8 references are cited by the author. Only 3 references are cited in the introduction chapter, which is not sufficient. Wheat is a major crop and significant research has been conducted on wheat. It will be better to add more references.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. The language is suitable for scholarly communication. However, I will advise the authors to run a spelling and grammar check and use uniform English style (either UK or USA). For instance, the spelling of "colour" or "color".</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>There are some inconsistencies in the manuscript. For example, in results and discussion section, flag leaf width has been calculated and mentioned for 33 genotypes instead of 30.</p> <p>Moreover, Plate 1 does not provide relevant information. For example, seed size can be cropped as seed size is not focused in the manuscript, and only three grain shapes instead of four (as mentioned in the results and discussion chapter) are shown in the plate 1.</p> <p>Figure captions placement should be uniform (either above or below the figure).</p> <p>The major concern is addition of three sowing dates in the materials and methods section that was not discussed at all in the results and discussion chapter.</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:	Muhammad Waqar Nasir
Department, University & Country	Hungarian University of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Pakistan