

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_130884
Title of the Manuscript:	Correlation coefficient along with direct & indirect analysis for important economic traits and yield in fennel (<i>Foeniculum vulgare</i> Mill.)
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	1. This manuscript provides crucial insights into the genetic relationships of key economic traits influencing fennel yield, aiding in effective breeding strategies. The findings enhance selection efficiency and support hybridization programs for developing high-yielding genotypes.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I have to suggest some of changes in research title 1. Genotypic and Phenotypic Correlation Analysis for Yield and Economic Traits in Fennel (<i>Foeniculum vulgare</i> Mill.)	
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.	1. Improve Grammar and Clarity 2. Refine Correlation Descriptions for Better Readability 3. Improve Path Coefficient Analysis Explanation	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	1. The manuscript are scientifically correct but require improved clarity, proper statistical interpretation, and refined phrasing for better readability	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	1. Add some of recent references	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. The language requires refinement for clarity, grammatical accuracy, and coherence to meet scholarly communication standards.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Kedar Mahadev Gheware
Department, University & Country	Sher-e-Kashmir University of Agricultural Sciences & Technology of Jammu, India