

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_127739
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Evaluation of Biostimulants on Growth and Yield of Finger Millet ( <i>Eleusine coracana</i> L. Gaertn.) in the Red Lateritic Region of West Bengal
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

#### PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	The study of the comparative evaluation of biostimulants on finger millet in the red lateritic region of West Bengal is crucial for identifying sustainable agricultural practices that enhance crop growth and yield, especially in nutrient-deficient and challenging soil conditions. This study provides valuable insights into eco-friendly methods to improve soil health and productivity in the red lateritic soils, a region prone to erosion and low fertility.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	<b>Yes</b> A comparative Evaluation of Biostimulants on Growth and Yield of Finger Millet ( <i>Eleusine coracana</i> L. Gaertn.) in the Red Lateritic Region of West Bengal.	
<b>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.</b>	The abstract of the article is comprehensive, but the corrections marked in the manuscript should be corrected to enhance clarity and provide meaningful understand.	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	Scientifically correct	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	Literature sufficiently addresses the topic being experimented upon. Secondary sources, use of current literatures and references deployed are adequate.	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The Language and English quality of the article appear generally suitable for scholarly communication., but there are some areas that could be improved for clarity, conciseness and readability will further improve its quality.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The manuscript requires revision. The observations marked in the text of manuscript should be incorporated for the improvement of the quality of the manuscript  <b>SEE ATTACHMENT</b>	

**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>Idu Hyacinth Kevin</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>David Umahi Federal University of Health Science, Nigeria</b>