

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_97648</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of spacing and hybrid on quality of summer pearl millet (<i>Pennisetum glaucum</i> L.) under south Gujarat condition</b>
Type of the 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)
<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)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The manuscript is very important for the scientific community and offers interesting ideas for research.</p> <p>The title of the article is apt and very effective</p> <p>The abstract of the article is exhaustive and ensures that the reader immediately understands the investigation.</p> <p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate and complete at all points.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>The references are sufficient and recent but I would still improve them to ensure that scholars can better study the paper examined.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The quality of the English language of the article is suitable for academic communication, it is fluent and correct</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The work is clear, very interesting. The reading is very smooth and this guarantees a good understanding.</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Carmine Boniello</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Salerno, Italy</b>