

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_126404
Title of the Manuscript:	Correlation of Traits and Path Coefficient Analysis among Morpho-Agronomic Traits of Sorghum [Sorghum bicolor (L.)Moench] Genotypes in the Central Plateau Zone of Rwanda
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	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.	We thank the reviewer for the positive comment
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Correlation and Path Coefficient Analysis for Morpho-Agronomic Traits of Sorghum [Sorghum bicolor (L.) Moench] Genotypes in the Central Plateau Zone of Rwanda	We thank the reviewer for this positive comment, and we wanted to address this important comment as suggested. However, another reviewer suggested a new title different from the first one, and we tried our best to address both comments simultaneously and we came up with a new title that is not 100% as you suggested, and we really apologize for that.
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.	Suggested in the manuscript	We thank the reviewer for this critical comment. We have addressed the comment and there are highlighted in yellow in the abstract (from line 6 to line 8, and line 27 of the page 1; while the suggested table is highlighted in page 4).
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Appropriate	We thank the reviewer for the positive comment
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.	The author has given authentic and clear data regarding the manuscript and he has put the information way it has to be. A table giving the details of the experimental material can be added to make the manuscript complete and look more authentic.	We thank the reviewer for the positive comment and the suggested table was included in the document and highlighted in page 4.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Sufficient and recent	We thank the reviewer for the positive comment
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English quality of the manuscript is suitable for scholarly communications	We thank the reviewer for the positive comment
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 3

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>	