

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_105393
Title of the Manuscript:	Validation Of Different Natural Farming System And Its Impact On The Yield Of Great Millet (Sorghum bicolor L.)
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>)

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Review Comments for the Article "Validation Of Different Natural Farming System And Its Impact On The Yield Of Great Millet (<i>Sorghum bicolor</i> L.)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. While writing Abstract , the Desi Cow –Bos indicus the basis of ZBNF, has to be cleared that all Cow Urine & dung to be considered as been sourced from Desi Cow only in case of ZBNF. 2. Review of Literature: The Author should have considered the collection of work in this field by different Researchers. At least 5 to 10 years of literature review should have been included. 3. Due to which Objective & hypothesis /purpose of research has not been taken. 4. Fantastic working on Pre and Post-harvest results are been obtained, but still there is scope for inclusion of one more aspect from ZBNF value addition point of view , i.e., Study on increase in Nutritional value of the output in comparison with produce from traditional farming . 5. One more Analysis graph could help author to show how he/she arrived on final conclusion. Otherwise connection between objective taken and the final conclusion was been established nicely. 6. Limitation of study has to mention: Being data taken from single geography location (Area of Research: TNAU, Coimbatore), so result may vary in different geography and environment. 7. Author should have mention the scope for further line research in this article. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Prakash Chandra Jha
Department, University & Country	Utkal University, India