

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_108364</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Correlation Coefficient and Path analysis of Pea (Pisum sativum L.)</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>1. This manuscript holds importance for the scientific community as it contributes valuable insights into the traits influencing high-yield crop varieties, a critical area of research given the growing global population's reliance on food production.</p> <p>2. The current title is somewhat vague and could benefit from greater clarity to better convey the paper's main focus. I would suggest considering a title that more explicitly reflects the research's core findings.</p> <p>3. The abstract appears concise but lacks comprehensive coverage. To enhance its quality, the author should clearly define the research problem, research question, study methodology, primary results, discussion points, and concluding remarks in a succinct manner.</p> <p>4. Structural changes have been recommended in the manuscript review to improve its organization and coherence.</p> <p>5. The manuscript's scientific correctness should be ensured. It's crucial that the author differentiates between the results and the discussion sections. The discussion should provide context, synthesis, and connections to existing literature while explaining any discrepancies. Results should be clearly presented in their section.</p> <p>6. it's important for the author to use in-text citations to support the points made in the text and acknowledge prior research contributions. If necessary, the author should consider adding references that are pertinent to the subject matter.</p> <p><b>I have added comments in the paper.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>After the corrections are applied, the final paper needs to be reviewed to enhance the writing to match the English quality for publication.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> 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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ateet Maharjan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Center for Advanced Transportation Technology Lab, University of Maryland, United States</b>