

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_100539
Title of the Manuscript:	Correlation and Path Coefficient Analysis for Yield and its Attributing Traits in Wheat (Triticum aestivum L.) Genotypes
Type of the Article	Agricultural applied research

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1- Yes, it contains results that plant breeders can apply, benefit from, and develop</p> <p>2- Yes, suitable</p> <p>3- Yes, short and comprehensive</p> <p>4- Yes</p> <p>5- Yes correct</p> <p>6- recent sources are few</p> <p>7- Additional comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The objective of the research is not clear, it should be at the end of the introduction. - In materials and methods, the researcher did not indicate the time and method for measuring each characteristic. - The researcher did not mention the texture of the soil to which the research was applied and the proportions of the elements present in it. - The researcher did not mention in detail information about the soil and crop service operations, such as the amount of fertilizer added from NPK and the water needs of those introduced varieties, as well as the planting date and harvest date for the crop. - It is preferable to provide the research with data related to the prevailing environmental conditions in the area in which the research is applied. - Adding the adjective number of days to maturity and the number of days to 50% flowering among the studied characteristics in the materials and methods, because the researcher referred to it within his results. - In the results and discussion, the researcher indicated that there is a high significant correlation between grain yield and the number of branches. Does he mean the total or fertile number of branches? - The research lacks scientific explanations for the results. - Clarifying the role of stalk length in affecting grain yield. -The paragraph in which the researcher spoke about the benefit of the Path Coefficient is moved from the results and discussion to the introduction. - How does the characteristic of the weight of a thousand grains increase the yield of grains? Which is more important for plant breeders and farms, increasing the number of grains per spike or increasing the weight of a thousand grains??? -It is preferable to repeat the application of the research in more than one site to know the extent of plant adaptation to the environmental conditions of that site before making recommendations. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes, suitable	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Fadia Fouad Saleh Hadi
Department, University & Country	University of Baghdad, Iraq