

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_127418
Title of the Manuscript:	Registration of a Climate-Resilient Bread wheat variety "Melka" for the highland of Ethiopia
Type of the Article	

#### General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

#### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>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.</b>	This variety is specifically bred to withstand climatic variability, including temperature fluctuations and drought, ensuring stable yields under stress conditions. Its adaptability and resistance to diseases like rusts make it a sustainable solution for improving food security, reducing reliance on imports, and supporting the livelihoods of smallholder farmers in these regions.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Introducing 'Melka': A Climate-Adaptive Wheat Variety for Ethiopian Highland Agroecosystems	
<b>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.</b>	<p>Here's a step-by-step methodology to craft an effective abstract:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Start with the Background and Objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Briefly introduce the problem or knowledge gap addressed by the study.</li> <li>Clearly state the objectives or research questions.</li> </ul> <p>Example: "Climate change poses challenges to wheat production in the Ethiopian highlands. This study aimed to develop and evaluate a climate-resilient bread wheat variety, 'Melka,' for these agroecosystems."</p> </li> <li>Describe the Methods <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Summarize the experimental design, treatments, and key methodologies.</li> <li>Include important details such as the location, duration, and specific analytical techniques.</li> </ul> <p>Example: "The study was conducted in multiple highland sites using a randomized complete block design (RCBD) to evaluate 'Melka' under varying climatic conditions."</p> </li> <li>Highlight Key Results <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Present the most significant findings, including quantitative results if possible.</li> <li>Focus on results that directly support your objectives.</li> <li>Example: "'Melka' exhibited a 25% higher yield and 40% greater drought tolerance compared to existing varieties, with improved resistance to leaf rust etc."</li> </ul> </li> <li>Conclude with Implications <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>State the relevance of your findings and their contribution to agricultural science or practices.</li> <li>Link your results to broader goals, such as food security or climate resilience.</li> <li>Example: "These results indicate that 'Melka' can enhance wheat productivity and resilience in highland agroecosystems, contributing to sustainable food security."</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	

**Review Form 3**

	<p>5. Maintain Clarity and Conciseness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoid excessive jargon and unnecessary details.</li> <li>• Ensure it is self-contained, providing a complete summary without needing to refer to the full paper.</li> </ul>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No	
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 Results and Discussion section requires improvement in structure and content. I recommend dividing it into clear subsections, with each variable or key finding discussed individually. Additionally, each subsection should link the current findings to relevant previous research studies to emphasize how your work builds upon or contrasts with existing knowledge. This will enhance the clarity and scientific context of the manuscript.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	More references should be added for the justification of the research or for the problem statement in the research	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language of the research paper is generally good; however, I noticed that many sentences or ideas are repeated throughout the manuscript. I suggest reviewing the text carefully to eliminate redundancy, which will improve the overall clarity and conciseness.	
Optional/General comments		

**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:	Rashid Abbas
Department, University & Country	Gomal University, Pakistan