

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | International Journal of Plant & Soil Science |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_IJPSS_127006 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | DISTINCTNESS, UNIFORMITY AND STABILITY (DUS) CHARACTERIZATION USING MORPHOLOGICAL TRAITS OF LITTLE MILLET |
| Type of the Article | |

PART 1: Review Comments

| Compulsory REVISION comments | Reviewer's comment | Author's Feedback <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. | This manuscript is significant for the scientific community because it provides new insights into "Distinctness, Uniformity And Stability (Dus) Characterization Using Morphological Traits Of Little Millet", addressing a critical gap in current understanding. The authors employ a robust methodology and present findings that could influence future research directions, practical applications, or policy decisions. I appreciate the manuscript for its clarity in presenting complex concepts and its potential to drive meaningful advancements in the field. | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | The title of the article appears to be suitable as it effectively conveys the main focus and scope of the study, capturing the interest of the target audience. | |
| 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. | Abstract is mostly comprehensive but could benefit from more emphasis on the key findings and their significance. Including a brief mention of the methodology used and specifying the most impactful results would enhance its clarity and relevance. Removing any repetitive or overly general statements could also improve its focus. | |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? | The subsections and structure of the manuscript appear appropriate and logically organized, allowing for a clear presentation of the study. | |
| 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 demonstrates scientific robustness through its thorough methodology, appropriate use of analytical techniques, and well-supported conclusions. The data presented aligns with the objectives, and the interpretations are consistent with the results. The study adheres to established scientific standards, ensuring technical soundness. The minor inconsistencies include a lack of clarity in certain methodological details and insufficient elaboration on some of the results' implications. Additionally, a few references to prior work could be better integrated to strengthen the discussion. Addressing these areas would improve the manuscript's overall scientific rigor. | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | The references appear sufficient and relevant to the study's scope, with most being recent and credible. However, There are groundbreaking studies or reviews published in the last 2-3 years directly related to the topic that have been missed, including those could strengthen the manuscript. | |

Review Form 3

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication. However, minor revisions are needed to improve clarity, grammar, and flow in some sections. Polishing certain sentences for conciseness and consistency would enhance readability and professionalism. Here are some minor revisions that could improve the manuscript:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clarify ambiguous phrases or overly long sentences in the introduction for better readability. 2. Correct grammatical errors, such as subject-verb agreement and punctuation inconsistencies. 3. Standardize technical terminology throughout the manuscript to maintain consistency. 4. Simplify overly complex sentences in the discussion section to enhance clarity. 5. Ensure proper formatting of references and in-text citations according to the journal's guidelines. | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>Here are some optional/general comments to enhance the manuscript:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The introduction could benefit from a clearer explanation of the research gap that the study addresses. Explicitly state how this work contributes to advancing knowledge in the field. 2. The methods section is clear, but a more detailed explanation of the statistical analyses or software used would help readers better understand the approach. 3. In the results section, include a brief summary of key findings at the beginning to help readers quickly grasp the main conclusions before diving into the data. 4. Ensure that all figures and tables are properly labeled, and refer to them consistently throughout the text. Some of the figure captions could be more descriptive to make them more informative. 5. The discussion section could expand a bit on potential future research directions based on your findings to provide a broader context for the implications of your work. <p>The manuscript shows promise but requires some minor revisions to improve clarity, address language issues, and ensure the structure is fully coherent. Once these revisions are made, it would be suitable for publication.</p> | |

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|---|------------------------------|
| <p>Name:</p> | <p>Purma Rishitha</p> |
| <p>Department, University & Country</p> | <p>India</p> |