

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>)

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. Yes. There is a wealth of useful information about foxtail production. The climactic impacts of foxtail is explained thoroughly.</p> <p>2. The last word in the title, "Condition", should be "Conditions". Keep capitalization of words in the title consistent. Check the journal template.</p> <p>3. No. The abstract needs more detail and results given. Too short as it is.</p> <p>4. No. There are section not even filled out. Both tables have incomplete data.</p> <p>5. No. There is too little discussion of the results and their possible impact.</p> <p>6. Should have a few references from 2020-2023. References aren't even cited in the "Introduction".</p> <p>Additional data and section formatting is needed. Clearly state the objectives at the end of the "Introduction". The paper is too short in length as well.</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>No. Extensive grammatical issues need to be corrected before this paper can be submitted.</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>This paper needs a significant amount of revision and additional text/data input. It is too sparse as it is now.</p> | |

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

| | Reviewer's comment | Author's comment <i>(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)</i> |
|---|--|---|
| Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name: | James Burke |
| Department, University & Country | University of Arkansas, United States of America |