

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_113695
Title of the Manuscript:	Deciphering Genetic Diversity in Advanced Wheat Lines (<i>Triticum aestivum</i> L.) for Yield and Other Yield Contributing Traits across the Locations
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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript presents valuable insights into the genetic diversity and relationships among 20 advanced genotypes of wheats used for the research offering significant implications for wheat breeding programs. With the help of cluster analysis and principal component analysis (PCA), the study interprets the genetic similarities and differences among the genotypes, providing a foundation for targeted breeding strategies and trait improvement. Moreover, the application of statistical methods such as UPGMA and PCA demonstrates the rigorous approach undertaken in this research, enhancing its credibility and relevance to the scientific community.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title is suitable. I feel like it catches reader attention.</p> <p>3. The abstract provides overview of study objectives, methods, results and conclusion. But yes, it may be benefited from additional clarity on methodology and result portion particularly regarding novelty and significance of the finding.</p> <p>4. Organization appears to be logical, clear subsections but somewhere in between methodology and while describing result lacks coherent and flow.</p> <p>5. I feel like its scientifically sound.</p> <p>6. References seems to be relevant and appropriate.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes the language is clear, concise and suitable for communication	
<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>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shreejana KC
Department, University & Country	Montana State University, USA