



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCS_47733
Title of the Manuscript:	The Role of, Genetic, Agronomic and Environmental Factors on Grain Protein Content of Tetraploid Wheat (<i>Triticum turgidum</i> L.)
Type of the Article	<u>Review Paper</u>

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Line 71-72: explain the gap in term of protein content or nutrition in Ethiopia • Line 86: how much is seed rate (low or high) – explain in seed per station or density per hectare • Line 104: Explain why conventional tillage has higher grain protein content than tillage condition? Is there competition effect? • Figure 2 (Line 141): It is the first figure, please revise and indicate if it is A or B (line 151) • Line 171: Zinc is the only one? If not, please name others and show the benefits of the most import such Zinc. • Line 180: What happen to other micronutrients? Is there any difference when apply soil or foliar based? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is explained in line 67-69. Please kindly refer it. • Line 86: 100 kg ha⁻¹ is the lowest seeding rate and 175 kg ha⁻¹ is the highest seeding rate, the detail is explained in the manuscript. • Sorry line 104 doesn't describe about tillage, it is about sowing date • Figure 2 (Line 141): It is figure 2B, I have indicated in the manuscript Line 171: the correction have been made in the document
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise all citation with more than one author (<i>et al</i> not in italic) • Look for other keywords different from title words • Mention in abstract that the study was based in revision of literature • Why titles changed to italic from 4.4 above? • Title: Remove common after role of, 	All the correction have been made in the document
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is well written and important information is there. Most of the reference are quite old. I suggest update some of the reference to 2014 and above.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	