

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_IJPSS_88240
Title of the Manuscript:	Phenotypic diversity of finger millet (<i>Eleusine coracana</i> (L.) Gaertn.) genotypes for grain yield characters
Type of the Item	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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVIEW comments	<p>Theme:Original cut. Although there are studies on this area as indicated by the author, it becomes original when this study is carried out in this specific area.</p> <p>Summary:The objective is clear and well planned, the methodology allows us to see the research process in a coherent way; therefore, the results show a significant contribution to the proposed genetic improvement.</p> <p>Keywords:You can use UNESCO Thesauri for keywords to help locate research within a universal language. Biotechnology, agricultural genetics, biological control...</p> <p>Introduction:The introduction is well done, it shows the problem, the context of the investigation, and its justification in an adequate way.</p> <p>Materials and methods:The materials describe the design of the experiment, in this case chosen randomly; describes how the sample selection was made; indicates the place where the study was carried out; Describe technique used. Finally, it accounts for the statistical analysis in an important way.</p> <p>Results and Discussion:The writing reveals a logical order, details common methods already used with results that are used for better criteria in this investigation; it shows important operational results, uses usual laboratory methods, no new applied method is made visible; statistics are used descriptively; makes a comparison with another similar study; it would be good to indicate possible future research; It would be important to indicate the difficulties encountered in the investigation, if any.</p> <p>Conclusions:The results are aligned with the stated objective, it shows the novelties found with social contribution, which is relevant.</p> <p>Bibliographic references:The references are very weak for an important investigation as it has been proposed; the authors always bring academic seriousness to an investigation; it is suggested that there be at least 40 bibliographical references. It is important to take into account the requirements of the journal.</p>	
Minor REVIEW comments		
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

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:	Jverson Santiago Quishpe Gaibor
Department, University & Country	Salesian Polytechnic University, Ecuador