

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCS_127031
Title of the Manuscript:	Development of Bread Wheat (<i>Triticum aestivum</i> L.) Varieties for lowland areas of Ethiopia and registration of the “Asgori” variety
Type of the Article	

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.	The study of identifying improved crop varieties is crucial for enhancing agricultural productivity in Ethiopia, given its diverse agro-ecologies. Multi-location trials involving 75 wheat genotypes helped identify Asgori, a high-yielding, disease-resistant variety that outperforms existing varieties in grain yield. Asgori's resistance to rust diseases and its adaptability to rainfed conditions make it a sustainable option for farmers, improving productivity and food security.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	The abstract is comprehensive and effectively highlights the key findings. However, it would be enhanced by explicitly discussing the broader implications for breeding programs.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript's structure is appropriate, with clear delineation between sections like the introduction, materials and methods, results, and discussion. Each section logically builds on the previous one, contributing to the scientific narrative of the study.	
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 manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. By using multi-location trials to select the best performing genotypes, Ethiopia can improve its food security, boost agricultural productivity, and provide farmers with resilient and high-yielding crop varieties tailored to their diverse agro-ecological regions.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes references are sufficient and recent. Suggested to change font of journal name in italic and change volume number in bold.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is generally clear, but a few grammatical errors and awkward phrasing should be addressed. Proofreading for grammar and sentence structure would enhance readability.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is well-written, well explained. Addressing the minor revision comments will enhance the clarity and impact of the study.	

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:	Shahina Perween
Department, University & Country	Birsa Agricultural University, India