

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science  |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_AJRCS_109408  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Identification of high-yielding barley genotypes with adequate foliar disease resistance in north delta of Egypt |
| 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?<br/>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable?<br/>(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- Very useful in a way to screen genetic potentiality of genotypes obtained after hybridization selection breeding program.</p> <p>2- I suggest changing "Identification" into "Evaluation and screening for high-yielding..."</p> <p>3- The abstract needs some precisions about the experiments settings, aims and impact of chosen diseases of the country itself.</p> <p>4- yes</p> <p>5- I think that the author needs to precise if this trial is made for a post-breeding program of barley to evaluate obtained genotypes otherwise, heritability parameter is not very interesting to calculate.</p> <p>6- acceptable with about 20% of less than 5 years recent references.</p> <p>7- In key words, we find "yield loss" but there is no calculation of yield loss percentage (for example) in the article.</p> |   |
| <p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>  | <p>1- I think that some words do not fit the scientific style (too vague): meticulously evaluated, scrutinized, orchestrated.<br/>In page 2 : "Area" instead of "aria"</p>  |   |
| <p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>  | <p>A broad sense style is frequently used in the article. Scientific precision is required.<br/>For example, more details are needed in Material and Methods part to describe the experiment.</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:                            | <b>H. Benkorteby-L</b> |
| Department, University & Country | <b>Algeria</b>         |