

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_124483
Title of the Manuscript:	Correlation and path studies in grain amaranth (<i>Amaranthus hypochondriacus</i> L.)
Type of the Article	Original Research

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 manuscript presents valuable insights into the correlation and path coefficient analysis of grain yield and its components in <i>Amaranthus hypochondriacus</i> L. The detailed study of the relationship between plant characteristics and yield can provide a foundation for future research in plant breeding. The identification of traits that significantly impact grain yield will be beneficial for optimizing agricultural practices. Overall, the research has the potential to contribute to the understanding of plant traits that enhance productivity, especially for this underutilized but highly nutritious crop.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The current title, "Correlation and Path Studies in Grain Amaranth (<i>Amaranthus hypochondriacus</i> L.)," is appropriate but could be refined for better clarity. A suggested alternative title could be: "Correlation and Path Coefficient Analysis of Grain Yield and Its Components in <i>Amaranthus hypochondriacus</i> L." This would better reflect the focus on both correlation and path analysis related to yield.</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 provides a decent overview of the study but could benefit from more specificity regarding the methodology and results. For instance, it would be helpful to include specific data on the correlation coefficients and the significance of the findings. Additionally, mentioning the broader implications of the study, such as its utility in crop breeding programs, would make the abstract more impactful.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript is well-structured, with clear subsections for the introduction, materials and methods, results, and discussion. Each section flows logically, and the subsections within the results, in particular, are well-organized, enabling the reader to follow the correlation and path analysis results effectively. However, adding a distinct conclusion section summarizing the key findings and future implications would improve the structure.</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, as it follows established methodologies for correlation and path coefficient analysis. The use of a randomized block design and the application of statistical tools like ANOVA and heritability estimates contribute to the rigor of the study. The findings are consistent with prior research, and the analysis of both direct and indirect traits influencing grain yield is comprehensive. The manuscript demonstrates a sound understanding of plant breeding principles and offers relevant conclusions based on empirical evidence.</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 sufficient but could benefit from more recent citations. Most of the referenced studies are from earlier decades (e.g., 1950s, 1960s, and 2003). Incorporating newer research from the past five to ten years, especially on amaranth breeding, path analysis, and correlation studies, would enhance the credibility and relevance of the paper.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality is adequate for scholarly communication, but there are several grammatical errors and awkward phrasings throughout the manuscript. For example, phrases like "much reliance con not be placed" should be corrected to "much reliance cannot be placed." Additionally, terms such as "reased", "was calculate", "to facility", "will all", "per pant", and "raised in bed size" should be revised for clarity. A thorough language editing would significantly improve readability and professionalism.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Overall, this manuscript provides useful insights into grain amaranth yield traits, and the findings will be of interest to researchers in the fields of crop science and plant breeding. To improve the quality, the authors should consider refining the abstract, revising the title for clarity, and conducting a more thorough language review. Additionally, updating the references with more recent studies will strengthen the manuscript's relevance. The study's practical implications for breeding programs should also be more clearly highlighted in the conclusion.</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:	Leong Wee Phin
Department, University & Country	First City University College, Malaysia