

**Review Form 3**

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | <b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>  |
| Manuscript Number:       | <b>Ms_IJPSS_121715</b>  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>Demonstration by new Finger millet Variety ATL 1 to Improve the Productivity in Villupuram District of Tamil Nadu.</b> |
| Type of the Article      |   |

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments   | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <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 a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.                        | It is an original research carried out over one growing seasons that provides data that can serve as benchmarks for comparative studies. Important for popularization!   |  |
| Is the title of the article suitable?<br>(If not please suggest an alternative title)   | Yes  |  |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.   | Yes  |  |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?  | Both the Materials and methods as well as the Results and discussions are quite clearly presented, but very briefly.   |  |
| Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | The work is based on concrete results obtained from the field and statistically interpreted, but it refers to a single season of vegetation and the results are little compared with others obtained and known. It requires broader discussions. |  |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.   | There are also recent titles, but they seem to be self-quotes. The bibliography could be improved in the context of more detailed discussions of the results obtained.   |  |
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  |  |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?   |  |  |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments  | The paper is very carelessly written; it is not the same font  |  |

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

### Review Form 3

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name:                            | <b>Codruța Mihaela Dobrescu</b>  |
| Department, University & Country | <b>The National University of Science and Technology, Pitești University Centre, Romania</b> |