

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_105887
Title of the Manuscript:	Path Coefficient Analysis for Yield and Its Attributing Traits in Wheat (<i>Triticum aestivum</i> L.)
Type of the Article	

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>Yes, the manuscript details about an important biometrical technique in plant breeding</p> <p>Yes, the title is suitable.</p> <p>The abstract is written good and it is composed</p> <p>There are few clarifications needed in the results and table discussed. Moreover, the manuscript has written more as a thesis form rather than as an article form.</p> <p>Yes, the citations are found to be recent and relevant</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The authors are strongly recommend to add data on correlation as the path analysis alone does not provide an adequate selection criteria. It will be better to discuss the relationship between the traits first, then followed by the direct and indirect effects. 2. The section of material and methods should be modified in to a simpler form in order to get devoid of any confusions among the readers. 3. The results part has to merged and converge into one or two paragraphs. Authors should discuss yield and yield related traits as a separate table and paragraph and quality traits in a different section and table. 4. There is a mention of phenotypic diagram in the results part which is not found in manuscript. 5. Kindly revise the manuscript (especially the results section) as there are many incomplete sentences leading to confusions. 6. Authors are requested to give explanation for the below inferences <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Major yield governing characters such as test weight and spike length (negative direct effects) and number of productive tillers and number of grains per panicle are showing insignificant direct effects to grain yield. b) The abstract and conclusion suggests selection of number of productive tiller per plant, 1000 grain weight, number of grain per spike, number of spikelets per spike and spike length for the improvement of wheat lines although these characters do not have significant direct effect on grain yield 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and vocabulary must be improved. The authors are strongly suggested to check grammar mistakes</p>	
<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)
<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:	S. Sasipriya
Department, University & Country	Malla Reddy University, India