

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_118738
Title of the Manuscript:	Response of Intercropping Finger millet on Growth and Yield of Pulses
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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>This manuscript is well written with a good English, containing important information presented clearly. The information may enrich the knowledge on the role of intercropping system. Therefore, I think this manuscript is important for the scientific community.</p> <p>There are some notes to improve this manuscript before publication:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The result in the subchapter Conclusion is different from those written in Abstract? Why? Please check and revise. 2. Tables 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 were not clearly referred to in Results and Discussion. 3. It is better to add one more table in Materials and Methods to list all treatments to increase this subchapter readability 4. Please break Materials and Methods into 3-4 paragraphs to increase its readability. Please also add one more paragraph containing short note about land preparation, planting and maintenance. 5. Reference is too thin, containing only 12 publications and only 6 publications are current. Please enrich! 6. It is better to write data in 3 significant digits (See the corrected manuscript). 7. Please arrange keywords alphabetically, do not use words already used in title. 8. Please revise sentences with wrong SP agreement ((See the corrected manuscript). 9. Mention the name of country somewhere. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes, it is.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	-	

PART 2:

	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>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:

Name:	Abdul Kadir Salam
Department, University & Country	University of Lampung, Indonesia