

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_107923
Title of the Manuscript:	Estimation of Genetic variability, Correlation and path analysis for yield and some yield contributing traits in bread wheat ( <i>Triticumaestivum</i> L.)
Type of the Article	Original paper

### 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. 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><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p><b>Yes is important for scientific communication</b></p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No comprehensive it lacks replicability</p> <p>No appropriate</p> <p>No</p> <p>Most of the references are too old they could contribute nothing to recent studies. Most of them are not well formatted and require immediate attempt. References guideline not well adhered for instance Khan <i>et al.</i>(2005), Ayccek and Yldrm (2006), Prasad <i>et al.</i> (2006), Payal <i>et al.</i> (2007), Dharamandra and Singh (2010), Tripathi <i>et al.</i> (2011), El- Mohsen (2012) and Singh <i>et al.</i> (2012). Rathod <i>et al.</i> (2019) Kamani <i>et al.</i> (2017).</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The manual script is poorly written it could fit for publication after major revision, on the results part should be separated from the discussion. I tried to pinpoint some problems of manuscript in the main manuscript however I could not do all</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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</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>Amosi Leonard Mbuji</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>China Agricultural University, China</b>