

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_118375
Title of the Manuscript:	Minor millets – Miracle grain of South India: A review
Type of the Article	Review Article

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Question 1: the manuscript is important for scientific community and if the manuscript is adopted and published can be used to inform the researcher, scholars and development partners that may want to trade and invest in southern India.</p> <p>Question 2: it is not well formulated, however, I have suggest;-it as “ The miracle of minor millet grains in south India”</p> <p>Question 3: the abstract should show at least the three (3) parts such as; 1. The main body, 2. The key findings, methodology and key areas of focus and, 3. Conclusion part, however, in the review document, the part which is not clear is part 2.</p> <p>Question 4: the sub-section and the structure of the manuscript is slightly well developed, however, more social- biological factors were captured, there is need to integrate the economic factors to consider inclusivity, there is need for a market trend sub section. Ensure numbering of the headings to differentiate between the main section and the subsection, the phrasing of words should be synonymously, ensure the font is aligning in the whole document, “paragraphing”, “space” between line; 1.15 to 1.5</p> <p>Question 5: Yes, the manuscript is scientifically structured.</p> <p>Question 6: The references suggested are just enough to articulate the document concept framework.</p> <p>Suggestions/comments: I suggest that you read more literature to better understand the social-economic- political and biological factors that are attached to the article and community perception over the minor millet.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Yes!</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Consider rephrasing some statements mainly in the abstract and add some information as directed in my comments on abstract, paragraphing and spacing between lines while using the recommended fonts, conduct more literature review on the minor millets beyond India</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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>	Not applicable

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Waigolo Joshua
Department, University & Country	Uganda