

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_125288
Title of the Manuscript:	CHARACTERIZATION OF BREAD WHEAT GENOTYPES USING SSR MARKERS FOR TERMINAL HEAT TOLERANCE
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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 manuscript "Characterization of Bread Wheat Genotypes Using SSR Markers for Terminal Heat Tolerance" is important for the scientific community as it addresses a critical issue in agriculture—wheat's ability to withstand terminal heat stress, a growing concern due to climate change. By using SSR markers to identify heat-tolerant genotypes, the research offers valuable insights into improving wheat resilience, which can lead to more sustainable food production and food security. I appreciate the manuscript for its application of molecular tools to address a real-world challenge, and its potential to inform breeding programs aimed at developing heat-tolerant wheat varieties.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title "Characterization of Bread Wheat Genotypes Using SSR Markers for Terminal Heat Tolerance" is suitable for the article. It clearly conveys the key elements of the study: the focus on bread wheat genotypes, the use of SSR (Simple Sequence Repeat) markers as a genetic tool, and the specific trait being analysed, which is terminal heat tolerance. This title provides potential readers with a concise understanding of the research scope and methodology, making it both informative and appropriate for the scientific content.	
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 of this article is relatively comprehensive, covering the key components of the research, but there are areas where it could be more concise and focused for clarity. Overall, the abstract provides a good overview of the study's objectives, methods, and findings.	
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 manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound as it applies well-established molecular techniques, such as SSR (Simple Sequence Repeat) markers, for the genetic characterization of bread wheat genotypes. The use of SSR markers to identify QTLs associated with heat tolerance is a widely accepted method in plant breeding, ensuring the reliability of the genetic data. Furthermore, the combination of molecular data with phenotypic traits like grain yield and heat susceptibility index (HSI) strengthens the study by providing a comprehensive assessment of the genotypes' performance under heat stress.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language of the article generally conveys the research well, but it could benefit from improvements to enhance clarity and flow, which are important for scholarly communication. Overall, the language is functional, but polishing it would enhance its suitability for academic publication.	
Optional/General comments	I wrote down some recommendations in the manuscript document.	

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:	Serban Eugen Cucu
Department, University & Country	National Research and Development Institute for Food Bioresources, Romania