Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Plant & Soil Science**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJPSS_115173**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Selection of major yield contributing traits by multiple linear regression model in finger millet (Eleusine coracana L.)**
Type of the Article	

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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments **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.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	**This manuscript tries to identify the main characteristics of millet to optimize millet yield, using 2 years data collection with standard statistical tests. The paper is acceptable from a technical/statistic point of view and with proper title, abstract and document structure. The overall outcome is somewhat very obvious, ie millets with more and bigger ear head and higher threshing percentage will lead to better yield (intuitively, you don't need to do statistical test to know tree with higher fruits density leads to higher fruit yield), but having the statistical decomposition of each parameter remains interesting. The references are recent and sufficient.** **Suggestions:** **While describing the dataset (eg, '*for grain yield, none of the genotypes was statistically superior to the popular variety, GPU-28, but, the mean ear weight was higher (>10.22 g/ear) in germplasm accessions GE-4596 and GE-4683 than in cv*'), providing a boxplot of each characteristic with coloured individual dots per variety would be extremely helpful to apreciate 1) the distribution of the factors and 2) the position of GPU-28 compared to the other ones. Covariance plots could also be helpful.** **Similarly, the predictions of yield improvement could be better presented, for instance showing expected improvement for each variety (with decomposition of factors explaining this increase)**	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	Yes	
Optional/General comments		

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	Not applicable

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Thibaud Derippe**
Department, University & Country	**United States**