

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_96679
Title of the Manuscript:	Overview of sorghum (sorghum bicolor.L), economic importance, ecological requirements, and production constraints in Kenya
Type of the Article	Review 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>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are 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 suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. The paper under review provides an overview of the sorghum crop, emphasizing its biology, economic importance, ecological requirements, the current production status in Kenya and production constraints. It reveals that there exists a huge untapped market for sorghum grains locally and globally. Achieving optimal production potential to meet the increasing demand requires adopting climate-smart technologies, improved flow of information to farmers, government policies, credit services, and market infrastructure. Thus, it is important for the scientific community, the public, and governments. 2. The title of the article is suitable. 3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. 5. In my opinion, the manuscript is scientifically correct. 6. The references are sufficient in number and recent.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Grammatical errors may kindly be removed. In many places in the text of the research paper, articles such as 'a', 'an', and 'the' are missing. In some places, punctuation marks need to be included/corrected.	
Optional/General comments	The abstract of the paper is concise. The content of the paper is good. The reported results are well explained. Materials and Methods are adequate. Conclusions describe the findings in a nutshell. References are relevant.	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Devinder Pal Singh
Department, University & Country	Acoustics Research Center, Canada