

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_103964
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Millets Based Integrated Farming System for Food and Nutritional Security, Constraints and Agro-diversification Strategies to Fight Global Hidden Hunger: A Review</b>
Type of the Article	Review

### **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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) YES</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable? YES</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? NO</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Somehow</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?Yes</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. References are sufficient but some are not found in the text.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The writer just downloaded things in internet and did little or no articulation of the information gathered. Paragraphing were not done. The words highlighted with yellow are the contributions I made to make the work meaningful, but the ones in red should be removed. They conflict the work.</p> <p>The abstract is so ambiguous that I have to articulate what should be. Please supply the missing information required.</p> <p>Moreover, figure1, and tables 1-5 were not mentioned in the body of the manuscript and should either be expunged or be included in the body of the manuscript.</p> <p>Figure 3 did not appear in the body of the manuscript and should be expunged or added to the body of the manuscript.</p> <p>Figure 5 is not Part of the body of the manuscript and should be expunged or put into the manuscript.</p> <p>References in red cannot be found in the body of the manuscript. They should be fixed into the body of the manuscript or be expunged.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? Average</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>Oluchi Nwankudu</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Michael Okpara University of Agriculture, Nigeria</b>