

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_121106
Title of the Manuscript:	Correlation and Clustering for Yield and Its Attributing Traits in Maize (Zea mays L.) hybrids
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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>This research could be important to maize breeding program of several institution, although this manuscript requires clearer and deeper objectives and major analyses of the results. In my opinion, the correlation of five traits and clustering analysis of 150 maize accessions were described and discussed too superficially and could not be sufficient to deserve to be a scientific article. What were the differences between the maize accessions in the clusters obtained? even Table 3 was included but neither mentioned nor discussed.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is suitable.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract is not comprehensive. There were analyzed five or six traits? Why these studied traits be useful in maize breeding in stressful environments, while this research evaluated these traits in normal conditions?</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>This research is scientifically correct, although, there are some flaws that should be completed and addressed. Another example: why were used "maize checks" when they were not even compared or analysed as controls in the analyses? Or discussed its clustering with other accessions? Were they used to ensure the accuracy and reliability of the analyses?</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references are not sufficient. Consequently, inclusion of references in the discussion was poor.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English writing should be revised, there are several poorly understood sentences or phrases in the MS. A phrase or sentence should not begin with a number.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Phenotypical evaluation descriptive statistics should be included as a table and discussed, and the genotype list as a supplementary material.</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	Julio Alfonso Chia Wong
Department, University & Country	Universidad Nacional Agraria de la Selva, Perú