

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_103969
Title of the Manuscript:	Study of genetic variability, Heritability, Correlation and path Coefficient Analysis for yield and it is related components and rust resistance in F5 and F6 population of bread wheat (Triticum aestivum L.)
Type of the Article	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.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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>This study is relevant as wheat is an important food crop. In general, the subject dealt in the manuscript is of interest to the readers of this journal.</p> <p>Title is not suitable because it is too lengthy. Author can add alternative title as "Study of genetic diversity for rust resistance and yield related traits in F₅ and F₆ populations of bread wheat (<i>Triticum aestivum</i> L.)".</p> <p>Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>References are not of recent years and there are many mistakes in the reference part. References are not in single format.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, it is suitable but there are many minor mistakes in the article.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Title:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Convert "it is" in the title to "it's" Try to make the title more attractive <p>Abstract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In aim part of abstract, write "in the breadwheat" in the last In methodology, remove ")" from the second line after evaluated Write "Puccinia striiformis" in italics In result, change "yield-related" to "its related" Remove "the" from 2nd and 3rd line of result Use "generations" instead of "generation" after F₅ and F₆ In conclusion, convert "the possibility" into "there is possibility" <p>Introduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Write the scientific name properly (<i>Triticum sp.</i> L.) Change "in terms of acreage and in terms of production" to "in terms of acreage and production" Convert "agro-climatic conditions, wheat production" to "agro-climatic conditions. Wheat production" <p>Statistical Analysis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In heritability part, use "broad sense heritability" instead of "board sense heritability" In disease screening method part, change "recorded following the" to "recorded using the" Remove ", " after screening and rust <p>Result and discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In analysis of variance part, use "." after [16, 17, 18, 19, 20] and change 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>“difference wheat characters” to “different wheat characters”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 3.2.1 heading, write Yield and its component variation • In 3.2.1 paragraph, convert “8.49 % and 7.64% and 11.68% and 10.2% in both generation” to “8.49 % & 7.64% and 11.68% & 10.2% in both generations” • In last line of 3.2.1 paragraph, change “Number spikelets per spike” to “number of spikelets per spike” • In 3.2.2, correct the spelling of “phenological” • In first line of 3.2.2 paragraph, convert “day” to “days” • In 3.2.3 paragraph, write “in” before “which” and in the last line, write “respectively” • In 3.2.4 first paragraph, write full form of PCV • In 3.2.4 second paragraph, remove “was” after “[22]” • In 3.3, change “by” to “into” in the second line and convert “effect” to “affect” and “Reported” to “reported” • Use only one sequence “, and” in the whole paper • In 3.4 title, convert “Estimates” into “Estimation” • In 3.4 paragraph, change “mean measurement” to “mean is the measurement” in first line, remove “and” after base population in the second line, “GA for the” to “GA was reported for the” and “where low GA” to “whereas, low GA” • Try to change the title of Tables 5 and 6 (Remove “the” from the title, “s” from coefficient and generation. Write the small alphabets in the sentence except the first alphabet of first word • In 3.5 title, remove “s” from the coefficient • Change the title of 3.6 to “Path coefficient analysis” • Remove “in this study” from 3.6 paragraph • In 3.7, write “reported” in small letters after “[40]” • Change the title of table 12 to “Reaction of parents and progenies of F₅ generation to yellow rust” and do same for the table 13 <p>Conclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convert “yield contributes characters” to “its contributing characters” in 2nd line • Use “and” before the last character mentioned in the paragraph • Use “i.e.” in italics • Write 5 and 6 in F₅ and F₆ in subscript • Use “,” after “In F5 and F6 generations” 	
--	--	--

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:	Palvi Thakur
Department, University & Country	India