



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_46206
Title of the Manuscript:	Physiochemical properties and identification of elite genotypes for improved sorghum breeding in Tanzania
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The paper is important because it provides information to facilitate the genetic improvement of sorghum cultivars</p> <p>The objectives of the research are not clearly stated The materials and methods are very complete and very well developed The results are expressed as "Pearson correlation analysis indicated to positive significant correlation between 100 seed weight and kernel hardness ($r = 0.250$, $p = 0.013$) (Table 2); while kernel hardness had a positive significant correlation with protein concentration ($r = 0.225$, $p = 0.026$). Starch concentration had a negatively significant association with mean kernel diameter ($r = -0.200$, $p = 0.048$) "although correlations are significant, due to the large amount of data, they should not be considered by the low value of the correlation, $r = 0.25$ is $R^2 = 0.06$, which indicates a great scattering of the data. The rest of the results are well presented. The conclusions are poor for the large amount of information obtained and would lack further discussion of the results.</p>	<p>The comments from reviewer are very useful. Because they address very important issues in this manuscript. We are glad to respond on the following very key issues raised;</p> <p>Objective of the research: In accordance with the Reviewer's comment, we have now restated the objectives to make it clearer: i.e. "<i>To characterise sorghum genotypes based on kernel phenotypic and biochemical traits and identify promising genotypes for better utilisation of these traits in sorghum breeding</i>".</p> <p>Correlation analysis: We agree with the existence of weak correlation among studied variables. But, as a reference to other researchers we thought its good idea to present the findings and re-interpret them as per reviewer's comment. We recommended the need for further research to confirm the findings. Generally, the discussion on correlation analysis have been reviewed accordingly.</p> <p>The conclusion: We agree with the reviewer's concern; we have therefore <i>revised the conclusion and include much more details based on the study objectives. The conclusion now consist of statistical details, the identified promising genotypes based on traits studied, and indicate the areas for further research.</i></p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The research is well carried out and generates a lot of information. To improve the scientific quality of the paper, the objective of the work would be more clear, it would review the interpretation of the correlation analysis, it would include a greater discussion of the results, and it would raise conclusions with a greater degree of affirmation and more strength.</p>	<p>The reviewer is right; we have restated the objective, revised discussion on correlation analysis, and re-written the conclusion</p>
Optional/General comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

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?	<u><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></u>	