

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCS_126551
Title of the Manuscript:	Registration of New Bread Wheat Variety (Gutu) for Mid to Highland Altitude Wheat Producing Areas of Ethiopia
Type of the 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.	This manuscript makes a meaningful contribution by documenting the development and release of a new bread wheat variety (Gutu) that shows significant yield advantages (25-52%) over existing varieties while maintaining better resistance to major wheat diseases like yellow and stem rust. The research is particularly valuable for food security in Ethiopia and similar regions, as wheat is a staple crop and existing varieties often have short lifespans due to disease susceptibility. The comprehensive multi-location trials over two years (2021-2022) across different agro-ecological zones provide robust evidence for the variety's stability and adaptability, while the detailed morphological, agronomic, and disease resistance data make this work highly reproducible and practical for both researchers and farmers.	
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.	Yes, the current abstract does include several key elements like: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Background context about wheat as a staple crop and disease challenges ii. Basic methodology (30 lines tested, locations, design) iii. Key finding about yield advantage over checks iv. Disease resistance and kernel quality advantages v. Final outcome (variety release) However, I would suggest the following additions to make it more comprehensive: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Add specific altitude range and agro-ecological zones where the variety is recommended 2. Include quantitative data about key agronomic traits that distinguish Gutu: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Days to maturity ii. Thousand kernel weight iii. Hectolitre weight 3. Add specific information about disease resistance levels 4. Include the actual mean yield value rather than just the percentage advantage over checks 	
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 demonstrates strong scientific rigor through its comprehensive multi-location testing approach, evaluating the new variety across 21 different environments (various locations and years) using a well-established row-column design with three replications, which provides robust statistical reliability for the findings. The research methodology is technically sound, incorporating standardized measurements of key agronomic traits and disease assessments using established scoring systems, while also including appropriate checks for	

Review Form 3

	<p>comparative analysis. The conclusions are well-supported by quantitative data, with clear documentation of the variety's superior performance in terms of yield, disease resistance, and grain quality parameters, all of which were consistently measured across multiple environments and years before variety release.</p> <p>The one area where the manuscript could be improved is in providing more detailed statistical analysis of the yield stability across environments. The inclusion of statistical significance levels (<i>p</i>-values) for the reported yield differences and more detailed analysis of genotype x environment interactions are recommended for improvement of the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>=</p>	<p>Yes, the references are sufficient and recent for inclusion in the manuscript.</p> <p>Nonetheless, I found that the authors have not followed the Journal's reference style, and also the referencing style is not consistent throughout the manuscript. Please recheck the references and follow the journal referencing style.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<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>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ayushman Malakar
Department, University & Country	ICFRE – Institute of Forest Productivity, India