

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_119479
Title of the Manuscript:	Estimating the Inheritance Patterns of Peduncle length and Spike length in Bread Wheat (<i>Triticum aestivum</i> L. em Thell.)
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, this manuscript is important for the scientific community, particularly those working in wheat genetics and breeding. It provides valuable insights into the inheritance patterns of peduncle length and spike length in bread wheat, which are important traits influencing yield. The study uses generation mean analysis across multiple families to elucidate the genetic control of these traits, offering useful information for developing breeding strategies to improve wheat productivity. The title "Estimating the Inheritance Patterns of Peduncle length and Spike length in Bread Wheat (<i>Triticum aestivum</i> L. em Thell.)" is suitable and accurately reflects the content of the manuscript. However, there is a minor typo - "aestivem" should be corrected to "aestivum". Yes, the abstract is comprehensive and provides a concise summary of the study's objectives, methods, key findings, and implications. The overall structure is appropriate, following a standard scientific format with Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results and Discussion, and Conclusion sections. However, the Results and Discussion sections could be more clearly separated to improve readability. The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct in its methodology and analysis. The generation mean analysis and interpretation of genetic effects are consistent with established approaches in quantitative genetics. The references seem sufficient and include some recent publications. However, including a few more recent studies (post-2020) on wheat genetics and breeding could strengthen the literature review and discussion. Some suggestions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Gao, S. et al. (2021). Genome-wide association study of spike-related traits in bread wheat (<i>Triticum aestivum</i> L.). <i>BMC Plant Biology</i>, 21(1), 1-14. <input type="checkbox"/> Sehgal, D. et al. (2020). Genome-wide association studies of drought-related metabolic changes in maize using high-throughput metabolomics. <i>Plant Cell</i>, 32(5), 1388-1408. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The overall language quality is suitable for scholarly communication. However, there are some minor grammatical errors and awkward phrasings that could be improved through careful editing.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The manuscript would benefit from a more in-depth discussion of the implications of the findings for wheat breeding programs. <input type="checkbox"/> Some figures or tables illustrating the genetic models and their fit to the data would enhance the presentation of results. <input type="checkbox"/> The conclusion could be strengthened by more explicitly stating the novel contributions of this study to the field. 	

[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>	This manuscripts has no ethical issues

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mahmoud Abbas Ali
Department, University & Country	South Valley University, Egypt