

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_JABB_117826
Title of the Manuscript:	Genetic divergence and Cluster Studies for Different Morphological traits in bread Wheat
Type of the Article	

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

(<https://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/editorial-policy>)

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>Yes. This work is important for wheat breeders</p> <p>Yes. I would add <i>Triticum aestivum</i> (or whatever corresponds) after the word wheat</p> <p>Yes. The summary is complete and clear.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes. The design and corresponding statistical analysis is appropriate.</p> <p>Yes but they are few. More should be included in both the introduction and discussion</p> <p>The work has a poor discussion of the results achieved. This section should be further explored to enrich the work. In addition, the introduction should delve deeper into the reasons for choosing the design and compare it with other authors.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yeah. But the conclusions section, which contains errors, should be reviewed.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Maria Andrea Esposito
Department, University & Country	Instituto Nacional de Tecnología Agropecuaria (INTA), Argentina