

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_116493
Title of the Manuscript:	Studies on genetic variability, correlation and path coefficient analysis for yield and yield contributing traits in Bread wheat (Triticum aestivum L.)
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://www.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/editorial-policy>)

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.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. It is no clearly how is the flag leaf area was measured.</p> <p>2. The study period (2019-2020) is not sufficient to establish the interaction between the genotype and the environment.</p> <p>3. Please, come sentence in Result and Discussion no considering to Tables:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ "The table revealed highly significant difference for replication and treatment mean square at 1% level of significance but for days to 50% flowering treatment mean sum of square is non-significant (significantant 26.58 **) for protein content replication mean sum of square is non-significant (significantant 4.70*). ✓ "The highest mean sum of squares due to error was observed for plant height, followed by harvest index and no of grains per spike." <p>The correct sentence is: The highest mean sum of squares due to error was observed for harvest index, followed by plant height and no of grains per spike.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ "The data revealed that the widest range of variability was for number of grains per spike (30.04-47.18) with mean value 39.08, (Days to maturity) 128-142 with mean value 134.2, (1000 seed weight) 31-52.47 with mean value 43.41, (Plant height) range between 92-105 with mean value of 97.68 cm, (Flag leaf area) range of variability between 14.19-24.99 with mean value of 19.09 cm2. <p>The correct sentence is: The data revealed that the widest range of variability was for (1000 seed weight) 31-52.47 with mean value 43.41, number of grains per spike (30.04-47.18) with mean value 39.08, (Days to maturity) 128-142 with mean value 134.2, (Plant height) range between 92-105 with mean value of 97.68 cm, (Flag leaf area) range of variability between 14.19-24.99 with mean value of 19.09 cm2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Highest phenotypic variance was observed in (Harvest index) 42.65 followed by (no of grains spike) 38.82, (Days to 50% flowering) 34.58". <p>The correct sentence is: 'Highest phenotypic variance was observed in No. of Effective tillers</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>(24.94) followed by Grain yield (23.11), Flag Leaf Area (21.70).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ In the Results section chlorophyll content is discussed, but in Table 4 there is no data for this indicator. ✓ The numbers in the following sentence not correspond of date in Table 4. "The estimate of genetic advance as per cent of mean was noticed for spike length (29.03), no of effective tillers (27.91), grain yield per plant (27.73)". ✓ The numbers in the following sentence not correspond of date in Table 5. " Maximum direct effect on yield was exhibited by biological yield (0.727) via harvest index (0.667), no of grains per spike (0.181) and plant height (0.089). The grains per spike had positive direct effect on yield (0.181) and had relatively high correlation with no effective tillers and 1000 seed weight." <p>4. Please, specify the following sentence: Path-coefficient analysis revealed that the maximum positive direct effect exhibited by grains per spike, no of grains per spike plant height.</p> <p>5. Please, specify some sentence in the text in Abstract part, considering to the errors in the results.</p> <p>6. Incorrect citing in the text in Introduction part: (Robinson et al., 1951 and Johnson et al., 1955).</p> <p>7. Please, rearrange the references by letter "B".</p>	
--	--	--

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:	Angelina Muhova
Department, University & Country	Institute of Field Crops, Bulgaria