

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_99742</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Response of Sulphur and Zinc on Yield and Economics of Pearl Millet. (Pennisetum glaucum L.)</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### 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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments  1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community, particularly for future improvement of Pearl Millet mainly targeting on its productivity and quality</b></li> <li>➤ <b>The title of the manuscript/article is suitable and can be considered as best fit title</b></li> <li>➤ <b>Abstract part of the paper is more of precise and comprehensive, except background part (rationale of the study has to be justified)</b></li> <li>➤ <b>Yes, sub-sections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate according to my observations</b></li> <li>➤ <b>The manuscript is scientifically acceptable and meaningful</b></li> <li>➤ <b>The references for this paper are more or less sufficient but try to incorporate recently promoted or published references to make more updated</b></li> </ul>	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments  1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ For scholarly communications, the quality of English language throughout the manuscript is very good and can be understandable by any person around the scientific community</li> </ul>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ None</li> </ul>	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Zeru Yimer Kebede</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural Research, Ethiopia</b>