

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_97162
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Correlation coefficient in 20 genotypes of Gladiolus (Gladiolus grandiflorus L.) for Gwalior region.
Type of the Article	

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:

(<https://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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)
1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	Yes, it is. But better if an amendment is made on almost all parts of the paper.	
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it is. But it will be better if it is re written as "Genotypic and phenotypic correlation of 20 genotypes of Gladiolus for Gwalior Region"	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	So how it is. But it has to be improved in a way that includes the statement of the problem, the research design used, the data collected and how the collection is done, the way the collected data was analysed, the greatest and smallest return along with the cost and the like. Because the abstract should stand alone and encompass all the necessary information of the manuscript if someone wants to understand the overall content of the paper by reading the abstract.	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No. Starting from the introduction all of the subsections of this manuscript need improvements. For example, the introduction is not supported with relevant source/articles. The objective of the paper is totally missed. The materials and methos part also need improvement by including the detail description of the study area, genotypes used for the study, the treatments, the data collected and how collection is made, the data analysis, the software used. The plot size, number of plants per plot, sampling techniques are also missed.	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	Somehow it is. But it is necessary to include and made improvement based on the comments and suggestions included on No 4 above and on the main body/manuscript.	
6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	They are not sufficient mainly on the introduction part there is not citation almost all in all. Therefore, the introduction par shall be supported by recent and relevant sources. Additionally, there a number of citations which are not included on the reference list and reference which are not used in the main body are also list on the references list which is total unacceptable in scientific writing. Please look properly and make a correction	
(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	I have read the manuscript and forward my suggestions rationally and scientifically on each and every part. So would like to embolden my final comment, the paper should be revised and rewritten by incorporation all the comments indicated on each part for the betterment of the manuscript and to increase its acceptance for international authors	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	With minor issues, it is suitable	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.7

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> Yes. There are a number of citations not listed in the bibliography and references listed without any citation in the main body. And should be revised based on the comments given above and on the manuscript itself.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Endalkachew Baye
Department, University & Country	Salale University, Ethiopia