

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_97275</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>IMPACT OF CLUSTER FRONTLINE DEMONSTRATIONS ON YIELD OF CHICKPEA (<i>Cicer arietinum</i> L.) IN PRAKASAM DISTRICT OF ANDHARA PRADESH</b>
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:

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

**Review Form 1.7**

**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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The article is written on a current topic, contains the results of original research, and may be of interest to specialists in the field of agriculture, particularly those who deal with the problems of growing chickpeas.</p> <p>2. The title of the paper is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the paper is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. Subsections and structure of the paper are appropriate.</p> <p>5. The paper is scientifically correct, but there are some remarks (see notes below).</p> <p>6. The references require revision (see notes below).</p> <p><b>Among the recommendations, it is worth noting the following:</b></p> <p><b>1) The category of the article is not specified. Given its structure and content, the article reflects original research. In this case, it has insufficient volume - a little more than 2,300 words, while the recommended volume is between 3,000 and 6,000 words <a href="https://peerreviewcentral.com/index.php?page/general-guideline-for-authors">https://peerreviewcentral.com/index.php?page/general-guideline-for-authors</a></b></p> <p><b>2) It is necessary to clearly define the research's goal and task in the article's text.</b></p> <p><b>3) It is necessary to review the correctness of the calculations in Table 2, in particular, for the "% increase over control" column</b></p> <p><b>4) For table 2, the "B: C ratio" column, it is necessary to indicate which data these calculations were based on.</b></p> <p><b>5) In the "Technology Index" section, it is necessary to provide the author's interpretation (analysis) of the obtained results.</b></p> <p><b>6) In the "B: C ratio" section, it is advisable to conduct a cost analysis for the introduction of new chickpea-growing technologies. This will help justify the results of this section.</b></p> <p><b>7) The "References" section mainly contains sources published over ten years ago. It is worth updating this list with more modern publications.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**Review Form 1.7**

**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>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Svitlana Grygoruk</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Khmelnyskyi National University, Ukraine</b>