

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAERI_120716</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>To study the performance of finger millet varieties in different establishment methods in terms of growth, yield, and quality. (Eleusine coracana L.)</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://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The article is important for the scientific community and is written on a topical topic.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article corresponds to the content.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract provides comprehensive information about the content of the article.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The article is well structured.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The conclusions are well-founded, but: Specify the area of the experimental plots. Enter the name of the soil on the experimental field according to the World Reference Base for Soil Resources (WRB) classification. Specify the methods for determining the content of protein, calcium and other quality indicators used. Specify which mathematical analysis of the obtained results was used and which software was used.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. =	The introductory part must contain at least some references to literature. It is preferable to use more recent literature.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 2:**

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

#### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Serhii Rieznik</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>State Biotechnological University, Ukraine</b>