

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_106356
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance of Foxtail millet based Intercropping system for improving the Productivity, Sustainability and Economics in Western Zone of Tamil Nadu Under Irrigated Condition
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> <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. Importance: They conducted a field experiment to study the performance of the Foxtail millet-based intercropping system for improving productivity, sustainability, and economics in western Tamil Nadu under irrigated conditions.</p> <p>2. Title: Long and preferred to be modified into “Growth and Economics of Foxtail millet Concerning Irrigating Conditions in Western Tamil Nadu”.</p> <p>3. Abstract: Extremely defective. Please notice the following:</p> <p>a. Provide an opening statement of one or two short sentences as a background on the problem.</p> <p>b. The abstract lacks a brief on the methods used and treatments, results, and a conclusion for the study.</p> <p>c. Some modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text.</p> <p>4. Structure of the manuscript:</p> <p>a. Keywords: Re-arranged in alphabetical order as suggested.</p> <p>b. Introduction: Improperly displayed as four paragraphs. The introduction has to be rearranged into three paragraphs only i.e. 1. Introduction 2. Significance of the study, and 3. Aim of the study. Some modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text.</p> <p>c. The aim: Not listed. The aim has to be listed by the end of the introduction section.</p> <p>d. Materials and methods: Please notice the following:</p> <p>1. Provide the institutional ethical approval for the study.</p> <p>2. The details on dealing with the seven set treatments were not mentioned at all.</p> <p>3. No statistical analysis section was provided. Provide the statistical analysis with a reference for the used software and the statistical model for the statistical analysis.</p> <p>4. Some modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text.</p> <p>e. Results: Missing many items and left blank such as Relative crowding coefficient, Aggressivity, Competition ratio (CR), and Competition index (CI). Some modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text.</p> <p>f. Discussion: Not listed.</p> <p>g. Conclusion: Not listed.</p> <p>h. Tables: Columns were left blank in tables 1 and 2 which is not logical.</p> <p>5. Scientific Soundness: The manuscript can not be considered a real manuscript and it lacks many sections such as defective abstract, defective methodology, defective results, no discussion, no conclusion, and lack of updated references.</p> <p>6. References: MUST BE UPDATED as 25% (2 out of 8) of the listed references were published in the past five years. The application of old and un-updated references negatively impacts the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>General view: The manuscript was expressed in moderate English and grammar. Professional copyediting, proofreading and reference updates have to be carried out before resubmission to achieve publishing value.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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>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:	Essam Samir Soliman
Department, University & Country	Suez Canal University, Egypt