

ReviewForm3

JournalName:	JournalofScientificResearchandReports
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_JSRR_127739
TitleoftheManuscript:	ComparativeEvaluationofBiostimulantsonGrowthandYieldofFingerMillet(EleusinecoracanaL. Gaertn.)intheRedLateriticRegionofWestBengal
TypeoftheArticle	Researchpaper

PART1: 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)
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.	This manuscript is important because it makes a comparative study of Biostimulant's effect on Growth and Yield of Finger Millet (Eleusine coracana L. Gaertn.) in a Red Lateritic Region to make possible the cultivation of this crop everywhere. It revealed particularly the performance of Protein Hydrolysates and Amino Acids in improving the growth and the yield of finger millet. However, the authors do not follow the recommendations in the guide for authors and do not use the paper template of the journal. For example, the lines are not numbered like the case in the paper template. The policy used in this manuscript is Times New Roman instead of Arial used in the template. In addition, the author did not include these sections "acknowledgements", "competing interests" and "authors' contributions" in the manuscript	
Is the title of the article suitable? (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. The abstract of this article is comprehensive. However, the structure does not respect the recommendations given in the guide for authors. The authors do not start the abstract by providing the aim. They have to give the meanings of the abbreviations like 'RDF' at their first appearance in the text	
Is the manuscript scientifically correct? Please write here.	Yes. However, the authors should use control treatments (negative or positive) for a better comparison of the results. By including for example an untreated control (no application), the author would be able to better convince that the observed effects are due to the application of biostimulants. In addition, the "materials and method" section is not well developed, the results are presented in tables and	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them here.	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	The main comments can be found in the reviewed manuscript. I recommend that the author take these observations into account carefully. PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT	

[ReviewForm3](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sawadogo- Ilboudo Tinkoudougou Cathérine
Department, University & Country	Institut de Recherche en Sciences Appliquées et Technologies, Burkina Faso