

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCS_126457
Title of the Manuscript:	Enhancing Wheat Performance: Impact of Sowing Timing and Growth Regulators on Yield Traits
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>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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>
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 is important as it addresses the combined effects of sowing timing and plant growth regulators on wheat yield, a crucial factor for food security in the face of climate change. Its rigorous methodology and significant findings provide valuable insights for optimizing wheat production practices. I appreciate its practical implications, though further research on diverse conditions could enhance its applicability.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is generally suitable but could be more concise. A suggested alternative is: "Optimizing Wheat Performance: Effects of Sowing Timing and Growth Regulators on Yield" . This maintains the focus on wheat performance while streamlining the phrasing for clarity and impact.	
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 is comprehensive but could benefit from highlighting the statistical significance of the findings and emphasizing broader implications for agricultural practices. Streamlining some language for clarity would also enhance readability.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The organization clearly presents the introduction, methods, results, and conclusion, allowing for a logical flow of information. This structure effectively supports the study's objectives and findings, making it easy for readers to follow the research process.	
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.	This manuscript is scientifically robust due to its rigorous experimental design and comprehensive statistical analysis, ensuring the validity of the findings. The focus on both sowing timing and plant growth regulators offers valuable insights into optimizing wheat production, making it a significant contribution to agronomy.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references are generally sufficient and include many recent studies, ensuring relevance to current research on wheat production. However, adding more recent works specifically addressing the synergistic effects of sowing timing and plant growth regulators could strengthen the manuscript. Including additional reviews or meta-analyses would also provide broader context for the findings.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The article is well-structured and uses appropriate agricultural terminology, making it suitable for scholarly communication. It provides detailed methodologies and clear statistical analyses, ensuring replicability and validity. Overall, the grammar and syntax are strong, effectively conveying the research's significance in optimizing wheat production.	
Optional/General comments	Consider enhancing engagement in the introduction by emphasizing the real-world implications of improved wheat yield. Including visual aids, like graphs, could effectively illustrate key findings. Expanding the discussion to address limitations and future research directions would strengthen the overall impact of the study.	

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:	Muhammad Sajjad
Department, University & Country	University of Agriculture, Faisalabad, Pakistan