

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_77534
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of Zeolite application on growth, yield and yield attributes of Finger millet (<i>Eleusine coracana</i> L.) in Rainfed condition
Type of the 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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript presents the results of a set of field experiments, aiming to study the influence of doses of Zeolite and fertilizers on growth, yield and yield components of finger millet.</p> <p>In my view, rather than a research article, that could be quoted as “experimentation article”. The authors presented information on the levels of fertilizer and zeolite which led to higher growth (and other). That's ok. But no mechanistic explanation for the results was given, which would be required in a classical research article. The authors, on the other hand, presented some speculation in the discussion, using the results of other authors on the physical (water retention) and chemical (N availability) properties of zeolite to explain their results. If the publishing policy of the IJPSS is open to such type of experimentation, that's fine.</p> <p>The text needs a deep revision of English writing.</p> <p>The results were presented in three large a confuse tables. I would suggest some figures in order to make it clearer.</p> <p>Finally, the statistical procedure was not explained in the M&M section. Alson, the statistical interpretation of the results in the tables were not clear, which make the difficult to follow the results and conclusions.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Fabio Pinto Gomes</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Universidade Estadual de Santa Cruz, Brazil</i>