

Review Form 1.7

Magazine name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript number:	Ms_ IJECC _106744
Manuscript title:	Trait association and pathway analysis for yield and yield-attributing traits in bread wheat [<i>Triticum aestivum</i> (L.) emThell] genotypes.
Item type	

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review comments

	reviewer comment	Author's Comment (If you agree with the reviewer, please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory for authors to write their comments here)
<p>Mandatory REVIEW Comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important to the scientific community? (Please write a few sentences about this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article appropriate? (If not, please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the article summary complete?</p> <p>4. Are the 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 suggestions for additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from the 6 points mentioned above, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript reveals: The UNESCO THESAURUS is a universal glossary that allows the subject to be located within a specific aspect of the sciences. Therefore, it is important to work with this tool: Agriculture – Cultivation – Yield – Cereal...</p> <p>The background, problem and justification are relevant.</p> <p>The research context is appropriate, the randomized row experimental design is relevant for this type of study, as is the selected population. The formula for reading results is appropriate.</p> <p>The results are compared with other studies, denoting new findings regarding the way to determine new factors for performance evaluation. In some cases the coincidence with other results studied is noted. It would be pertinent to indicate future lines of research that may arise from this study. A weakness is noted in the support of specialized literature.</p> <p>Since the objective of the research does not exist, its conclusions cannot be assessed.</p> <p>2. Hetopic is suitable for research.</p> <p>3. It is important that the objective of the research be mentioned. The methodology and results are appropriate. It is important to indicate the conclusions that have been reached.</p> <p>4. The structure contains the elements that are required for this type of publication. However, there is a weakness in some elements that must be reviewed.</p> <p>5. The article partially meets the requirements required to be scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references are not very current. It is suggested that they be at least between 30 – 50 taking into account that these support the problem and the research findings.</p>	
<p>Minor REVIEW Comments</p> <p>1. Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for academic communications?</p>	Adequate	
Optional/ General comments		

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:	Jeverson Santiago Quishpe Gaibor
Department, University & Country	Salesian Polytechnic University, Ecuador