

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_129550
Title of the Manuscript:	PRINCIPLE COMPONENT ANALYSIS (PCA) OF WHEAT GENOTYPES CONCERNING MORPHOLOGICAL RESPONSES TO HEAT STRESS
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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript should be to evaluated wheat genotypes for heat stress , by sowing late and the evaluated using PCA analysis as a mathematic analysis	Noted
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	Thanks
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.	Need to be clearer	Ok
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Need mor to be new reference all ref old there were much work for same studies new	ok
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Need more reviewed	
Optional/General comments	1-The manuscript was about the heat stress so the experiments must be at least two years evaluated to could say the genotypes is heat tolerance 2- the introduction is so poor, ref old about what, for heat stress ref about the physiological traits and the manuscript should at least study this trait 3- for heat stress at least need two locations to compare the genotypes under normal and stress temperatures of wheat area 4- if one location there's no information about this area should be noted in introduction and M&M 5- abstract is not clear or imperative 6- M&M studied seven traits, there no differ between days to heading and days to flowering, but in table there are 8 traits, and in the biplot figure six traits what is the right?? 7 results where the A nova analysis and the mean performance for the genotypes before use the PCA analysis	Effected Noted and effected Revised

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>	