

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_111386
Title of the Manuscript:	PATH COEFFICIENT ANALYSIS STUDIES ON SEED YIELD AND SEED YIELD CONTRIBUTING CHARACTERS IN GREEN GRAM [Vigna radiata (L.) R. Wilczek]
Type of the Article	ORIGINAL

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 sub-sections 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>I will say yes, but the manuscript is pointing at the authors as beginners. So, such is welcome in scientific community and are encouraged to start growing with their manuscript under assigned mentor (supervisor).</p> <p>Yes, it is in consonance with other pre-existing titles.</p> <p>I will say yes, but will point at the comment number (1) which says the authors should be mentored to grow scientifically. I will strongly suggest that all the sub-sections be joined and their spaces closed to have a block scientific report.</p> <p>It is not correct as it is, but if the reviewer's comments 1,2,3 and 4 are effected, it will become better.</p> <p>The size of the research made the references partially sufficient, but three (3) of the references are too old for the manuscript. NB. Lu, 1959 is not cited in the in the references, but appeared in the body of the manuscript. Also, Dewey,1959 should be deleted as it did not appear anywhere in the manuscript. An enlarged version of this same topic will.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language/English quality of the article is manageably okay since I cited in (1) that the contents looked that of beginners, and so should be accepted and then subject the authors to scientific writing mentoring.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The authors should be welcomed with open arms and be subjected to mentorship under the supervision/mentorship of a big-hearted, older and more experienced scientist (s).</p>	

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:	Nwankwo, Michael Olisa
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Agriculture, Nigeria