

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_101822
Title of the Manuscript:	Genetic variability, heritability and genetic advance studies in field pea (Pisum sativum L.) for yield and its attributing traits
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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/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>The research article makes an attempt to study the extent of variability, heritability and genetic advance in Pea. The information generated could be used to decide on the breeding strategy to be adopted for improvement of different traits in the crop. Though the study is of routine nature, the result could supplement the already available information in this crop</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes. To be refined as indicated in the manuscript. A brief prelude of the work needs to be given</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction : Brief and up to the point. For better readability and meaning, may be redrafted as indicated • Materials and Methods : The design of experiment, number of replications and plot size to be specified. Content to be redrafted to avoid redundant sentences. Other corrections indicated in the manuscript • Result and Discussion : To be rewritten completely. • Conclusion : To be redrafted • Tables : Appropriate • References : Uniformity to be adopted while citing literatures 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Revision required as indicated in text	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The paper may be accepted for publication after necessary corrections, as suggested in the manuscript.	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	A. Subramanian
Department, University & Country	Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, India