

Review of: "Technological quality of wheat grains and flour as affected by nitrogen fertilization and weather conditions"

Mantshiuwa Lephuthing

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear Authors

The study is promising, but requires major revision, such as the experimental design, the flow of information on the literature review, the results, as well as the discussions. Please find some of my suggestions below:

Please include line numbers.

Abstract

Page 1: First line of the abstract: please remove "can be" and replace with "it". Also remove the statement "aiming to support....."

Introduction

Page 2-3: The paragraphs are too short and should be merged.

Page 2: The first sentence on paragraph three sounds like a repetition. It can either be removed or rephrased. Also, please delete "including soil and climate conditions" as form part of the environment.

Page 2: Please consider rephrasing paragraph five.

Page 3: Please delete "Ripe" and replace it with "Matured", also delete "including proteins that produce gluten" because gluten is a protein and not a by-product of proteins.

Page 3: Paragraph six has important information but needs to be rephrased and avoid repeating the information already.

Material and methods

Please include respectively after "1,495 mm".

Page 4: The study was only conducted for one (1) year. So, was it not possible to have the same treatment at PG(irri)?

Page 5: Please include the SI units used to measure the traits.

Page 5: Under “statistical analysis” please delete “submitted to” and replace with “evaluated for” Pearson correlation.

Results

Please consider using “respectively” after mentioning multiple values.

Page 7: When comparing the highest and lowest mean values, please mention only the genotype that corresponds to that, not the long chain in descending order.

The results in the first sentences of each paragraph do not appear on the tables (1, 2, etc). Please correct this.

Page 8: The statement “In L(irri), the genotype Sinuelo also.....” is incorrect according to Table 1, Toruk had the highest flour extraction (66.2%), while Sinuelo had 64.3%.

Table 1, 2 & 3: Ensure that all the values have the F-test results (letters to differentiate them).

Table 2: Check the different spellings of “Tenacidade/Extensibilidade” vs “Tenacity/Extensibility”

Page 9: The order of the tables is wrong.

References

Page 18: Please check that all the in-text references appear on the list.