

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant and Soil Sciences
Manuscript number:	Ms_IJPSS_98799
Manuscript title:	VALIDATION OF SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE EQUATIONS FOR FINGER MILLET IN THE DRY ZONE OF SOUTHERN KARNATAKA
Type of article	Original research article

General guideline for the peer review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected on the basis of "**lack of novelty**" alone, as long as the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. For the complete guide to the peer review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

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

PART 1: Review comments

	Commentary by the critic	Author's comment (if you agree with the reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory for authors to write their comments here)
Mandatory REVIEW comments 1. Is the manuscript important to the scientific community? (Please write a few sentences in this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article appropriate? (If not, suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article exhaustive? 4. Are the 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 any suggestions for additional references, please mention it on the review form. (In addition to the 6 points mentioned above, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<p>It is interesting to be able to validate a specific yield equation to be able to predict the production yield with soil fertilizer treatments this same model could be applied to other types of crops.</p> <p>That's fine, but I would suggest that it could be "validation of the equation in millet production to see the specific yield in the dry zone of southern Karnataka."</p> <p>If it is clear</p> <p>If it is according to the structure of a scientific article.</p> <p>This article is very well founded and tidy. The manuscript is solid enough and technically sound enough because it presents the originality is very clear.</p> <p>The number of references is sufficient to justify this work.</p> <p>But it would be good if the conclusion details the factors that influenced the validation of the equation.</p>	
Minor comments from REVIEW 1. Is the linguistic/English quality of the article adequate for scholarly communications?	The language of communication between researchers from different areas or topics are written in English (universal language) for research and academic training	
Optional/general remarks	The article is very well founded and organized that has its originality	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rolando Mamani Quispe
Department, University & Country	Universidad Mayor de San Andrés, Bolivia