

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	Research article

Review Form 3

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)
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.	Sorghum is an important millet crop. Add some sentences regarding nutritional importance of sorghum. By reading this paper, in what way the other scientist get benefited.	-We thank the reviewer for this positive comment. We have addressed the comment, and the recommended information regarding sorghum nutritional importance was provided (highlighted in yellow in the second paragraph of the introduction from line 5 to line 12 of the second page). - By reading this paper, sorghum scientists will use the generated information to target the real traits by guiding them to prioritize traits and optimize breeding strategies for sorghum grain yield improvement. Also, scientists around the world will have information related to sorghum traits association in Rwanda, and they could request some of the genotypes utilized in this study through existing treaties related to germplasm exchange like the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture and Nagoya Protocol.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title is very long and comprising unnecessary wording. It may be like that. Association Analysis for Different Morphological Traits in Sorghum [<i>Sorghum bicolor</i> (L.)Moench] of the Central Plateau Zone of Rwanda	We thank the reviewer for this critical comment. We have addressed the comment, and the recommended title was included in the document (highlighted in yellow as a new title).
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 is well written and no needs to improve.	We thank the reviewer for the positive comment
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Subsections are well written.	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.	Manuscript comprises the general and routine work like correlation and path analysis of plant breeding perspective but in crop like Sorghum it is very important to find out the variation and selection of traits for further breeding programme. In this regard the manuscript is technically sound. As the part of importance in Introduction section some nutritional aspects may be added.	We thank the reviewer for this positive comment. We have addressed the comment, and the recommended information regarding sorghum nutritional importance was provided (Highlighted in yellow in the second paragraph of the introduction from line 5 to line 12 of the second page).
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	References are sufficient in number but lacking the recent one like year 2023 and 2024. Add if available. Shumbusha <i>et al.</i> , (2017) Adane <i>et al.</i> (2018) Above two references are not mentioned in reference list. Please mention it.	We thank the reviewer for this critical comment. We have addressed the comment, and some of the recent references were included (they are highlighted in yellow on page 2, page 7, page 9, page 10, and page 12). We have also added the missing references (Shumbusha <i>et al.</i> , 2017, Mukamuhirwa <i>et al.</i> , 2018), and they are both highlighted in the text and in the references. We also crosschecked and removed 1 paper that was mentioned in the reference but not cited in the text (Ezeanya-Esiobu, <i>et al.</i> , 2017) and another reference (Lenka, D. and Misra, B. 1973) that was mistakenly written twice in the references. For Adane <i>et al.</i> (2018), we apologize for making a mistake of citing him using the second name instead of using his/her surname (Gebreyohannes).

Review Form 3

		Note that Gebreyohannes was there in the references, and hence Adane was replaced by Gebreyohannes in the text and is now highlighted both in the text and in the references.
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English quality is good and suitable for publication	We thank the reviewer for the positive comment
Optional/General comments	Overall the manuscript is well in written. Minor corrections are suggested.	We thank the reviewer for the positive comment

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)	