

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_122918
Title of the Manuscript:	Role of Cluster Front Line Demonstrations (CFLDs) in summer green gram production in Faridabad district of Haryana
Type of the Article	Geneal nature

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Summer pulses are very important which not only benefit the income of the farmer but also enhance the soil fertility. Also it helps the pulse shortage of the country.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Ok	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Ok	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Need revision. The Table 1 and 2 may be merged. Table 3 should include the farmers ' variety (SML 668) performance.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	It is only of general importance , but help in technology adaptation by the farmer in enhancing the yield.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	yes	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	OK. Spelling mistakes may be corrected (for eg. Vigna radiate may be corrected as Vigna radiata.)	
Optional/General comments		

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	C R Anandakumar
Department, University & Country	Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, India