



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_45043
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Yield Analysis of Stem Rust Resistant Wheat Mutant Lines and their Parent Varieties
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	GENERAL COMMENTS: The references in this work are not too many for a work on a well researched crop as wheat. THE TITLE OF MANUSCRIPT is appropriate. The manuscript is also appropriate as an Original Research Article. ABSTRACT: The abstract has been well written but the authors should revise the abstract according to the structure and format stipulated in the guidelines of the journal stating the aim of the study, sample, study design etc. INTRODUCTION: Introduction is adequate but with few citations. Wheat is a well researched crop and there are many references that could have been cited. MATERIALS AND METHODS: This has been well-written. RESULTS: The results have been well outlined or laid out by the author (s) but should endeavour to number the tables in uniformity or in line with the way it has been numbered in the text. DISCUSSION: The authors have failed to do a thorough discussion of the paper as expected. The author(s) should endeavour to revise the discussion as much as possible citing relevant references from introduction and other sources. CONCLUSION: This chapter has been fairly written although it could be improved upon. REFERENCES: The literature list should be prepared in line to Journal Editorial Requirements	
Minor REVISION comments	The discussion should be more detailed.	
Optional/General comments	If all the corrections made on the manuscript are effected it should be accepted for publication as original research article.	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Essien Archibong Okon</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Cross River University of Technology (CRUTECH), Nigeria</i>