

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_108970
Title of the Manuscript:	Production of lac and seed of Cajanus cajan under varying stresses
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The simultaneous production of two cash crops (pulse and lac) from a single Cajanus cajan plant is an innovative and economically beneficial approach. This finding could inspire researchers and farmers to explore similar dual-crop systems for other plant species, potentially increasing overall agricultural productivity. The detailed information on lac production, 100 lac cell weight, and seed yield under varying levels of biotic stress provides a nuanced understanding of how stress factors influence different aspects of plant development. This knowledge is valuable for researchers studying plant-insect interactions and developing pest management strategies. The research emphasizes the significance of these findings for pigeonpea growers in both Africa and Asia, suggesting that the insights gained from this study may have broad applicability across different regions. This global perspective enhances the relevance of the research to a wider scientific audience.</p> <p>2. Yes 3. Yes 4. Yes 5. Yes 6. Yes (But reference should be right as per journal guidelines)</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Article is explain well and right up is very well return.	

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:	Mayurdhvajsinh H. Chavda
Department, University & Country	Sardarkrushinagar Dantiwada Agricultural University, India