

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_121624
Title of the Manuscript:	CORRELATION AND PATH COEFFICIENT ANALYSIS FOR GRAIN YIELD, HEAD RICE RECOVERY AND QUALITY TRAITS IN RICE HYBRIDS (<i>Oryza sativa</i> L.)
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: 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)
<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 provides valuable insights for rice breeders aiming to improve grain yield and quality traits. By focusing on traits with positive direct effects and significant correlations with grain yield, such as plant height, panicle length, and kernel length, breeders can make more informed selection decisions. The study's methodological rigor and clear presentation of results make it a significant contribution to the field of rice genetics and breeding. Overall, the study highlights the complex interplay between yield and quality traits in rice and offers practical guidance for breeding programs targeting higher productivity and improved grain quality.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes, 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 quite detailed and covers most aspects of the study, but it can be made more concise and clear by correct these grammatical mistakes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Change "to perform" to "performing" for parallel structure. <input type="checkbox"/> Add a comma after "checks" for clarity. <input type="checkbox"/> Change "positive significantly" to "positively and significantly". <input type="checkbox"/> Add a comma after "kernel breadth (mm)" for clarity. <input type="checkbox"/> Add "the" before "number of productive tillers" for correctness. <input type="checkbox"/> Add "and" between "positively" and "significantly" for readability. <input type="checkbox"/> Add "and" between "negatively" and "significantly" for readability. 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Overall, the manuscript's structure is appropriate, but minor improvements in organization and detail can enhance clarity and readability</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>The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound as it employs a well-established Line x Tester design to generate hybrids, which is a standard and reliable method in plant breeding research. The use of comprehensive statistical analyses, such as correlation and path coefficient analysis, to examine the relationships among various agronomic traits and their direct and indirect effects on grain yield, ensures that the findings are based on rigorous quantitative data. Additionally, the study's results are supported by a randomized block design with replications, enhancing the reliability and reproducibility of the results. The detailed presentation of results, supported by relevant literature, further corroborates the scientific integrity of the study.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>=</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript are sufficient and cover a range of studies relevant to rice genetics, yield, and quality traits</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>he language quality of the article is mostly suitable for scholarly communications, but it could benefit from some refinement to ensure clarity and precision. Here are a few suggestions to improve the language and overall readability:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Consistency in Units and Measurements: Ensure that units of measurement are consistently formatted, for example, "plant height (cm)" and "panicle length (mm)". It should be consistent throughout the text.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Use of Parentheses and Percentages: Ensure that percentages are formatted consistently, such as "hulling percentage (%)".</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Clarity in Sentences: Some sentences could be rephrased for clarity. For instance, "Plant height (mm), panicle length (mm), number of grains per panicle, 1000 grain weight (g), kernel length (mm), milling percentage (%) and head rice recovery had exhibited direct positive effect on grain yield per plant" could be rephrased to "Plant height (mm), panicle length (mm), number of grains per panicle, 1000-grain weight (g), kernel length (mm), milling percentage (%), and head rice recovery exhibited a direct positive effect on grain yield per plant."</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Grammar and Punctuation: Minor grammatical errors and punctuation issues should be corrected, such as missing commas and conjunctions.</p> <p>In summary, while the article is suitable for scholarly communication, a thorough proofreading and minor revisions will enhance its clarity, readability, and overall quality.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ravi Kiran Reddy Kondi
Department, University & Country	Louisiana State University, The United States of America