

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Plant Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_APRJ_126489
Title of the Manuscript:	Identification of Climate-Smart Bread Wheat (Triticum aestivum L.) Germplasm for Highland Wheat Growing Areas of Ethiopia.
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	In this article, the researcher identifies a compatible and high-yielding genotype. Any research that seeks to find a way to save humanity from food shortages is valuable.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It is best to have an article title that easily introduce the content of the article and is searchable by researchers. for example, the same this title: (Determination of compatible genotypes of wheat (<i>Triticum aestivum</i> L.) for cultivation in highlands of Ethiopia using statistical analysis of some plant traits)	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	It was good	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The experimental and statistical methods used in the article are good. There were some flaws that I mentioned in the text of the article.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	It was acceptable.	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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:	Maryam Faramarzi-Jafar Beiglou
Department, University & Country	Lorestan University, Iran