

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_97414
Title of the Manuscript:	Genetic Variability and Character Association Analysis for Seed yield and Its Attributes in Wheat (Triticum aestivum L.)
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review 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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes, the manuscript important for scientific community Researchers are moving towards this type of theme to remedy the problem of climate change.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. No, subsections and structure of the manuscript were not appropriate. The section "materials and methods" as well as "results and discussion" should be subdivided into subsections. Each table should be discussed separately.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct. However, authors can add the dendrogram of the different varieties.</p> <p>6. Some references are very old.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, English quality is suitable.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The citation of references is not homogeneous and non-compliant. The conclusion is to reduce and synthesize.</p>	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jamel Mejri
Department, University & Country	Ecole Supérieure de Ingénieurs de Medjez El Bab, Tunisia