

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ JEAI_114098
Title of the Manuscript:	Enhancing small millet farming resilience through conservation agriculture in rainfed regions
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ This is an important topic of great farming concern and relevance at the moment. Efforts of authors in bringing the most relevant and required knowledge are highly appreciated. ✓ Selected Title is catchy, appropriate and relevant to the concept. It is requested to mention title in the Title case format. ✓ Well written and covered all the important aspects of the experiment. ✓ The manuscript is well written and provides a thorough information on conservation agriculture ✓ The introduction chapter provides good view of the topic selected as well as the gap in our current understanding of the subject. ✓ The research paper covers many aspects related to the study. The sub-sections are well organized, and review is presented broadly in the systematic order. ✓ The interpretation in the light of the previous work is good and well discussed. ✓ It is requested to provide insights into your conclusion's implications and justify appropriately in order to bring scientifically sound, valid and meaningful conclusion. ✓ The reference section is well organised as per the standard format ✓ Few typographical errors in the reference section required minor corrections 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ English quality is most adequate, well connected and of good quality, however to add glory to the chapter, few typographical errors in the draft need to be address. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Syed Ali
Department, University & Country	University of Agricultural Sciences, India