

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_130379
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Planting Dates and Cultivars on the Expression of HMW-GS and LMW-GS Genes and Gluten Quality in Wheat
Type of the Article	Research Article

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.	The article is very successful as a subject of study, but insufficient in terms of content. Both the material and method used and the findings of the study were insufficient.	Thank you for your encouraging feedback regarding the relevance of the study's subject. We appreciate your constructive comments on the content, material and methods, and findings. 1. Regarding the material and methods: We have reviewed the methodology section and added more details to clarify the materials and procedures used in the study. This includes providing additional information on [specific aspects, e.g., experimental design, sampling process, or analytical techniques], which can now be found in Section 2. Regarding the findings: To address the concern about the insufficiency of the findings, we have revised the Results and Discussion sections. We have included additional data analyses and expanded the discussion to provide a more comprehensive interpretation of the findings and their implications
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Suitable title of the article.	Thanks for the comments
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 summary of the article is generally sufficient. Correct sentences are used to convey the content.	Thanks for the comments
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The study is scientifically correct, but there are deficiencies in material and methodology. In addition, the study reflects only a part of a larger piece. More detailed results should be given.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are inadequate and incomplete. References both in the article and in the bibliography should be checked. Especially the discussion section is very weak.	Thanks for the comments

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language of the article is appropriate at an intermediate level. Grammar structure is weak in some sentences.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The article is successful in terms of work quality, but weak in presentation and content. The introduction section is very short and the subject integrity is poor, especially the applications and procedures in the material and method are not presented in detail, only the findings are emphasised in the findings and discussion section, and the discussion is not carried out sufficiently. References are irregular and insufficient. Some analyses that should be given visually were not done. The writing language and scientific structure of the article are moderately successful. The necessary corrections are also given on the file.	Ok noted

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)	