

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_111608
Title of the Manuscript:	Path Coefficient Analysis of Rice (Oriza sativa L.) genotype under laboratory conditions
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript is of interest to the scientific community in view of the information provided in this study. 2. The title should be reworded as follows: Path Coefficient Analysis in Rice (Oriza sativa L.) genotype under laboratory conditions. 3. Please define the objective of this article. Insert the units of measurement for the different values if possible (length, weight, germination rate, etc.) adding a space between the values and the units; e.g. 200 g, 30%, etc. 4. In the materials and methods section, please present the figure of the experimental set-up used in the laboratory. Why was correlation not used for the degree of relationship between the three controls and the 45 germplasms? 5. The different sections must be well defined according to the logic of the review. In my opinion, in the results and discussion section, follow each table with its interpretation. 6. The manuscript is scientifically correct with a few minor revisions. Avoid writing authors' names in the text, as you have preferred to use numbers instead of citations. For example: (Brar and Khus, 2003) [1] 7. The presentation of references should be reviewed by deleting google scholar. Fill in the missing reference, for example: Anonymous, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, 2019. ???????????? 8. Standardize the presentation of references for all cited authors 9. For better comprehension, present the results first, followed by the discussion. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Take account of the comments made to improve the manuscript. Also add references for the last two paragraphs of the introductory section. Please give a brief description of the species in the material section, specifying the source of the information.	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dande Assikpu Patrick
Department, University & Country	University of Kinshasa, Congo