

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JSRR_120904</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Trend and Instability Analysis of Area, Production, Productivity of Millets in India</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> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	This manuscript is important because it addresses the under-researched area of millets' production trends and instability in India, a crucial topic for food security and agricultural policy. The study provides valuable insights into the fluctuations and patterns in millet cultivation, which can inform both policymakers and researchers. However, the manuscript needs significant revisions to improve its clarity, structure, and scientific rigor.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable and reflects the content of the manuscript accurately.	
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.	The abstract is clear and provides a general overview of the study. However, it lacks specific details about the methodology and the exact findings. It should include more precise information on the methods used and the key results.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate, but there are areas where the flow can be improved. Some sections are too brief and lack depth, while others are overly detailed. The authors should ensure a balanced and logical flow throughout the manuscript.	
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 manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound in its analysis of trends and instability in millet production. However, the statistical methods used need to be described in more detail to ensure transparency and reproducibility. The discussion section should also provide a deeper analysis of the implications of the findings.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and recent.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality is generally suitable for scholarly communications,	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The manuscript addresses a significant topic with practical implications for agricultural policy and food security in India. However, it needs substantial revisions to improve clarity, methodological transparency, and depth of analysis.	

### 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>N. Senthil</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Centre for Plant molecular Biology and Biotechnology, TNAU, India</b>