



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_48308
Title of the Manuscript:	Association Among Traits by Correlations and Path in Maize Genotype Selection
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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	The author(s) could re-check through the REFERENCES, The last reference is incomplete (Line 470). In Line 420: 'state' of Rio could be 'State' of Rio i.e. capital 's'. Through out the write up, state could start with capital letter; eg. in Lines 22, 56, 59, 77.	The authors agree with the necessary corrections. All requests were changed in the text and duly marked in yellow.
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Line 3: Topic could be put as - <b>Association Among Traits by Correlations and Path Analysis in Maize Genotype Selection</b></li> <li>2. Between Lines 9 and 10: Could be as follows – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Aim: In the State of Espírito</li> <li>- analyze the cause and effect of associations - <b>Study design:</b> Randomized complete block design, with sixteen accessions/genotypes and three replicates.</li> <li>- were evaluated, in a randomized complete block design with</li> </ul> <p><b>Conclusion:</b> The final plant stand and the mass of one thousand seeds were observed to be traits that could be the determinants to directly increase the grain yield.</p> <p><b>NB: The following could be changed as follows-</b></p> </li> <li>3. Line 33: populations could be increasingly promoted [9].</li> <li>4. Line 46: associated with high heritability [13]. Simple correlation, despite</li> <li>5. Line 76: Table 1. Accessions (genotypes) of</li> <li>6. Line 83: the randomized complete block design with sixteen genotypes (treatments) and three replicates,</li> <li>7. Line 89: three 4.0 m length lines spaced at 1.0 m</li> <li>8. Line 98: the moisture content of 13%.</li> <li>9. Line 114: sprayer with a 20 litre capacity. Mechanical weeding was used to control the</li> <li>10. Line 154: In order to verify the co-linearity between the traits, a multi co-linearity test</li> <li>11. Line 156: Subsequently, it was carried out through the split of the simple</li> <li>12. Line 185: environmental (re)</li> <li>13. Line 206: Could put in brackets as (-0.55)</li> <li>14. Line 213: (-0.57)</li> </ol>	The authors agree with the necessary corrections. All requests were changed in the text and duly marked in yellow.



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>13. Lines 221: (-0.46)</p> <p>14. Line 239: Could add to foot notes - *, ** = significant at 5 and 1% probability</p> <p>15. Lines 272 and 273: Could change significative to significant</p> <p>16. Lines 276,278,280: could change multicollinearity to multi co-linearity</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	A good write up.	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	