

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_JSRR_117695
Title of the Manuscript:	Correlation and Path Coefficient analysis for selecting morphological and biochemical traits in Potato (<i>Solanum tuberosum</i> L.) in the 'Terai' region of Uttarakhand
Type of the 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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. It could be an important piece of paper for the scientific community if it author(s) spent enough time to improve the language quality.</p> <p>2. The title sounds okay to me but can be improved.</p> <p>3. The abstract is also okay but has many junk words/sentences.</p> <p>4. Yes, it is, but again needs author(s) attention and improvement. Particularly the introduction, results, and discussion sections.</p> <p>5. Well, the authors have spent a lot of time conducting the experiments and writing this draft. I think it is inappropriate to ask this question or reject the manuscript at this stage, but we can request authors to submit a revised manuscript with careful consideration of the reviewer(s) comments and suggestions.</p> <p>6. Yes, references are reasonably okay.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. With due apologies the language especially the scientific language of the manuscript is very poor. It is recommended that authors read related articles published in well-reputed and impact-factor journals to improve the language and make this draft technically reads good.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The authors conduct very relevant research; however, it also has several shortcomings. Most of them are minor changes. I strongly encourage the author(s) to address these to improve the quality of their manuscript.</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:	Muhammad Zunair Latif
Department, University & Country	College of Plant Protection, Shandong Agricultural University, China