

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_104719
Title of the Manuscript:	Study of Genetic variability for yield and yield attributing traits in Finger Millet (Eleusine coracana L. Gaertn)
Type of the Article	Original

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:

(<https://www.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy>)

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	 1. Yes 2. Not enough. Suggestion made 3. Not enough. Key words mostly repeated from title of manuscript. Suggestion made 4. Sub-sections are missing 5. No. Data are not supported by discussion with references. Experimental layout must be displayed to check the GLM used for statistical analyses. Path analysis procedure not explained. 6. Not enough	 1. Yes 2. I have made changes according to reviewers comment 3. Changed according to suggestion 4. Added 5. I agree and changed 6. Added references
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Unfair. Needs to be improved (path analysis section not checked)	Corrected and well explained after review
Optional/General comments	Not scientifically sound	Agree

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	No ethical issues found