

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_98419
Title of the Manuscript:	Character association and path coefficient studies in cucumber (Cucumis sativus 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. Yes it is important for scientific community based on the information provided in the manuscript, it appears to be a valuable contribution to the scientific community. The study evaluates 32 cucumber genotypes collected from different states of India for yield and quality characteristics. The investigation of relationships between fruit yield and yield components, using correlation and path coefficient analyses, provides insights into the factors that affect cucumber yield. 2. Yes title of the article are well suitable. 3. Yes abstract of the article are well comprehensive 4. Yes subsections and structure of the manuscript are well appropriate. 5. Based on the information provided, the manuscript appears to be scientifically correct. 6. Yes references are sufficient and recent time.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments		

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Vipin Kumar Pandey
Department, University & Country	Indira Gandhi Krishi Krishi Vishvavidyalaya, India