

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_124117
Title of the Manuscript:	Delineation of selection criterion using correlation and path analysis in forage pearl millet (<i>Pennisetum glaucum</i> (L.) R. Br.) in North Gujarat condition
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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>The manuscript discusses the genotypic and phenotypic associations among green fodder yield and several agronomic traits of Pearl Millet in North Gujarat, India. The results of this study would assist in selection of key traits in Pearl Millet for green forage yield improvement. The subject and results of this study are of interest to the Pearl Millet improvement for green forage yield, but the manuscript requires major revisions.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>I would suggest the authors to change the title of the article to something like: Correlation and path analysis of green forage yield and agronomic traits in Pearl Millet (<i>Pennisetum glaucum</i> (L.) R. Br.)</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 poorly written I suggest the Authors to correct the following - Line 6 Variables not variable - Line 7 I suggest the authors to put it like the experiment was conducted using RCBD design - Line 8 ... Data collection was done from 5 randomly selected plants and this data was used for analysis ... not the five selected plants subjected to analysis - Line 14 genotypic and phenotypic level with green forage yield per plant</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Subsections and overall structure of the manuscripts are not well written</p> <p>Background - Line 4 Add reference - Line 5 Re -write - Paragraph 2 Line 3 Not selection of "desirable plant types" rather selection of genotypes - Paragraph 2 Line 9 It does not indicate. Not "it did not indicate".</p> <p>Materials and methods I suggest the authors should give more information about the genotypes used in this study i.e. are they improved genotypes, landraces, mixture of landraces and improved genotypes etc. and if possible, the list of genotypes.</p> <p>I suggest the authors to describe clearly how they measured each of the traits. For example, plant height was measured from the base of the plant to the tip of the head from randomly selected five plants. The same for other traits.</p> <p>The experimental design used in this study; is it Randomized Complete Block Design, I suggest authors to state it clearly.</p> <p>I suggest the authors to describe how they generated genotypic values of the traits.</p> <p>Results and discussions Overall discussion should be improved. Discuss more recent and relevant studies and support your findings.</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 clear and informative. The methods are appropriate eventhough it was conducted only in one environment. The results are presented in a logical and transparent manner. I suggest the authors to work on the comments to improve the manuscript.</p>	

Review Form 3

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	I suggest the authors to add recent studies specially in the discussion part and describe what was reported in the previous studies in comparison to the current study.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language is clear and suitable for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments		

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dejene Kebede Astatke
Department, University & Country	Makerere University, Ethiopia