

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_112500
Title of the Manuscript:	A Study on Growth Performance and Instability in Area, Production and Productivity of Millets in India
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. 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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The article entitled "A Study on Growth Performance and Instability in Area, Production and Productivity of Millets in India", has fulfilled the terms and conditions from a research point of view, and the research results are useful for monitoring the performance of Growth and Instability of Area, Production and Productivity of Millets in India. 2. I think the title given to the article is correct. 3. The abstract does not clearly describe the research problem to be carried out (research question). The methods and processes used have not been clearly described. The results obtained in the research have not been described specifically, especially in terms of obtaining results using a method in the process of monitoring production and productivity. It is better to use a percentage value to show the results of a good increase in performance from the proposed method compared to other methods or previous research. Every time a word is abbreviated, please provide the extension 4. In my opinion, globally it is good. For the writing structure, please look again at the writing structure that has been determined. 5. In my opinion, the manuscript written is scientifically appropriate 6. The references given in the manuscript are too minimal, it would be better to add other supporting literature from various similar research results, this is to enrich the data and information to strengthen the research results 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Please check again as a whole, especially the writing structure, thank you</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>other improvement suggestions:</p> <p>Introductory Part: It would be better if the introduction section shows the steps or stages of the research which are described in the form of a flowchart or work flow. Show the novelty of the research you conducted, as well as its relationship to previous research.</p> <p>Conclusion: Provides a more structured and simpler picture that shows that the results of the research carried out are useful. Use percentage values to show the superiority of the method used compared to previous observations or research results.</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:	Ir. Chairuddin
Department, University & Country	STMIK IM, Indonesia