

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_126041
Title of the Manuscript:	Studies on path coefficient analysis and correlation to evaluate the relationships between yield and its components in Fenugreek ( <i>Trigonella foenum-graecum</i> L.)
Type of the Article	

#### PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	This study identifies relationships between yield and other traits, helps breeders select traits for indirect selection, improving crop productivity and reveals positive, negative or neutral correlations, guiding trait prioritization optimizing breeding strategies through targeted trait selection.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Studies on correlation and path coefficient analysis to evaluate the relationships between seed yield and its component traits in Fenugreek ( <i>Trigonella foenum-graecum</i> L.)	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	The abstract should contain the material used for the study, season of experiment, number of traits, season and location of the experiment. Others comments were made in the manuscript. Please check.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	Results section is very vague. Tables for mean yield for all the traits studied, ANOVA, correlation and path co-efficient analysis has to be added. Discussion part was only confined to reports of other related experiments. The author has not given his point of view and his analysis for the results. Analysis of variance and Mean values subsections have to be included. The conclusion should also contain key points from other analyses also. Please add.	
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	This manuscript needs improvement to look scientifically robust and technically sound. Carrying out the comments in the manuscript might help to look better.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	The references are not recent. Recent references can be added.	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Good	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The technicality of the experiment in the manuscript depends upon the information provided in it. The author has to work on it.	

### **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:	A. Anisha
Department, University & Country	Acharya N. G. Ranga Agricultural University, India