

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_118686
Title of the Manuscript:	Study on the path coefficient analysis of certain matric traits in Brinjal (solanum melongena)
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/editorial-policy>)

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>This research has normally worked on path coefficient in Brinjal (solanum melongena) L. The manuscript was average for scientifically. Manuscript has major revision.</p> <p>Title is good no need to be change.</p> <p>Abstract is comprehensive and not written well. Many grammatically and scientifically revision require. My suggestion is, if possible, authors should be rewrite abstract.</p> <p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript is not appropriate. I have provided numerous comments and suggestions as well.</p> <p>Yes, the manuscript is scientifically normal, but many things missing like Mean square Table as well, references, grammar and writeup. The references are insufficient. I have provided numerous suggestions, please check out the reviewed manuscript, authors need to be use latest references in similar patron.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>English quality of the article is not very well and not suitable scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The authors worked well in this research experiment such as analysed but could not describe very well. In this research material method should be clear and need to be explain with fully procedures of traits to be recorded. Authors used old and insufficient references and could not conclude the novelty of this research. My suggestion to authors if possible rewrite the manuscript with technically sound.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sajid Hussain Rao
Department, University & Country	Pakistan