

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_AJSSPN_117989
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploring Genetic Variability: Unraveling Correlations through Path and multivariate analysis in finger millet (<i>Eleusine coracana</i> L.)
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajsspn.com/index.php/AJSSPN/editorial-policy>)

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes it is if it is improved</p> <p>It is to some extent</p> <p>It is fairly good</p> <p>The structure is okay however the author should decide where he wants tables and figures to be located.</p> <p>Yes however, this is a one season data Manuscript in one location only which is not adequate to make conclusive deductions.</p> <p>References are fairly sufficient. The style in citations and list of references should be consistent and therefore needs great improvement.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Fairly good English and revision required as indicated in the comments in the MS</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>All sections still require improvement and I consider this work in progress. More data is still required for this MS to be published if it is to add value to the scientific community.</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Lawrence Owere
Department, University & Country	National Semi-Arid Resources Research Institute, Uganda