

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_110972
Title of the Manuscript:	Identification of Resistant and Susceptible Sources against Blast Diseases in Finger Millet (<i>Eleusine coracana</i> L.)
Type of the Article	

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Importance of the Manuscript for the Scientific Community: This manuscript holds significant importance for the scientific community as it addresses the crucial issue of blast diseases in finger millet (<i>Eleusine coracana</i> L.). The comprehensive evaluation of 490 finger millet lines against leaf, neck, and finger blast disease, along with the identification of resistant and susceptible sources, provides valuable insights for researchers, agronomists, and breeders. The findings contribute to the ongoing efforts to enhance disease resistance and improve finger millet cultivation practices, which is particularly relevant given the crop's economic and nutritional significance.</p> <p>2. Suitability of the Article Title: The title "Identification of Resistant and Susceptible Sources against Blast Diseases in Finger Millet (<i>Eleusine coracana</i> L.)" effectively communicates the manuscript's focus.</p> <p>3. Comprehensive Nature of the Abstract: The abstract is comprehensive, providing a succinct overview of the research objectives, methodology, and key findings. It effectively summarizes the significance of the experiment, the number of lines evaluated, and the outcomes observed over multiple years. It serves as a clear and informative preview of the manuscript.</p> <p>4. Appropriateness of Subsections and Manuscript Structure: The subsections and overall structure of the manuscript appear appropriate, facilitating a logical flow of information. The manuscript is organized systematically, from the introduction and materials/methods to results and conclusions. The clarity in presentation enhances the readability and understanding of the research.</p> <p>5. Scientific Accuracy of the Manuscript: The manuscript appears scientifically sound, with a well-designed experiment, clear documentation of methodology, and meticulous data analysis. The use of standardized disease reaction categories and statistical analysis adds credibility to the findings. The conclusions drawn align with the presented data, supporting the overall scientific accuracy of the manuscript.</p> <p>6. Adequacy and Recency of References: The references provided are sufficient for supporting the manuscript's context and findings. The inclusion of key studies on finger millet blast disease, genetic resistance, and related research enhances the credibility of the work. However, to further enrich the reference list, recent publications (within the last two years) focusing on advancements in finger millet genetics and disease resistance could be considered.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Based on the clarity, structure, and apparent adherence to scientific research standards, the manuscript appears to fall within the "Minor Revision" category.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anatolii Tsarkov
Department, University & Country	University of Zambia, Zambia