Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Plant & Soil Science**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJPSS_131101**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Studies on Analysis of Correlation coefficient and Path Coefficient for Certain Quantitative Traits in Fieldpea (Pisum sativum L. var. arvense).**
Type of the Article	

<mark>PART 1:</mark> **Comments**

	Reviewer's comment <mark>Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.</mark>	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)*
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript holds significant value for the scientific community, especially for researchers in the field of genetics and plant breeding. The correlation and path coefficients for key quantitative traits in fieldpea. It offer crucial insights for optimizing yield through selective breeding. The findings on direct and indirect contributions of traits to grain yield provide a strong basis for developing more efficient breeding strategies.	
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	The current title is descriptive but somewhat lengthy and formal. A more concise and impactful alternative could be: "Correlation and Path Analysis of Quantitative Traits in Field Pea (*Pisum sativum* L. var. *arvense*)"	
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.	Abstract of the article provides a general overview of the study, but there are areas where it can be improved for better clarity and impact. Below are my suggestions: 1. Clear objective 2. Clarify the key findings 3. Simplify the technical details 4. Reduce redudnacy	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Manuscript appears to be scientifically correct based on the provided content. The use of well-recognized methodologies, such as those by Panse and Sukhatme (1967) for randomized block design and Dewey and Lu (1959) for path coefficient analysis, ensures scientific validity. The results are logically interpreted, showing the relationships between traits and their contributions to grain yield, which is fundamental in breeding studies. However few sections need attention for enhance clarity i-e Statistical validation, Discussion section, and Language and presentation.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references in the manuscript appear relevant, but many of them are somewhat outdated, with several citations from the mid-20th century (e.g., Al-Jibouri et al., 1958; Dewey and Lu, 1959). While foundational references are necessary for methodological validity, integrating more recent studies would provide a contemporary context.. However few suggestion i-e Recent papers on fieldpea genetics, correlation analyses, or path coefficient studies published in reputable journals (from the last 5–7 years) would be valuable and Relevant FAO or agricultural reports that provide updated statistics on fieldpea production trends globally or regionally.	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1- Correct grammatical errors such as missing articles, subject-verb agreement issues, and inconsistent tense usage. For example, "It is one of the most important pulse crop in India" should be "It is one of the most important pulse crops in India." 2- Some sentences are repetitive and verbose. For example, "Correlation coefficient gives an indication of the type and extent of the relationship between yield and yield contributing components" is repeated unnecessarily. 3- Strengthen conclusions in the abstract and discussion sections for a more impactful message.	
Optional/General comments	1- The manuscript provides valuable insights into the correlation and path coefficient analysis of fieldpea traits, which can guide breeding strategies for improved yield. The findings are relevant to plant breeders and genetic researchers. 2- Highlighting the practical applications of the research in breeding programs or agricultural policy would enhance its significance. This could help frame the study's importance better for a broader audience. 3- Ensure that all tables and figures are clearly labeled and easily interpretable. Providing visual representations of the major findings (e.g., a path diagram) could make the results more accessible. 4- Avoid overwhelming readers with extensive numerical details in the text. Focus instead on key trends, with detailed statistics confined to tables. There are no visible conflicts of interest based on the provided content No apparent ethical issues were found in the manuscript.	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Shehrooz Afzal**
Department, University & Country	**Institute of Botany, Bahauddin Zakariya University, Pakistan**