

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JSRR_116537</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Sporicidal Treatments to Produce Germinated Finger Millet</b>
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.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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>1. <b>No,</b></p> <p>2. <b>Yes</b></p> <p>3. No</p> <p>4. No</p> <p>5. No</p> <p>6. Recent but not sufficient</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>yes</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p><b>Abstract</b></p> <p>Do not meet the abstract writing a good abstract should contain:</p> <p>Rationale hypothesis (problem)</p> <p>Study design methods</p> <p>Results with data</p> <p>Conclusion implication</p> <p><b>Introduction</b></p> <p>The statement of problems and limitations of the study is not clear.</p> <p><b>Methods and material</b></p> <p>Do not have a logic of inquiry (qualitative or quantitative).</p> <p>2.3 and 2.4, lack of citation.</p> <p><b>Results and discussions</b></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

	<p>The author doesn't discuss well (poor discussions) and doesn't interpret what it means (previous work).</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>Poor conclusion</p> <p>NB: To write a good conclusion, go back to the objectives of your research. To be systematic about it, re-read the objectives of your study or the statement of the problem.</p>	
--	--	--

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Mesele Admassie</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Arsho Advanced laboratory, Ethiopia</b>