



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_41164
Title of the Manuscript:	Sustainable nutrient management in aerobic finger millet (<i>Eleusine coracana</i> (L.) Gaertn) under rainfed agriculture
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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 REVISION comments	ABSTRACT. - Knowledge gaps, objectives, measured parameters and data analysis method are missing within the abstract. - In the abstract indicate the GPRS location of the study site. - Ensure that the abstract is a representative of the whole paper in summary with all essential features. INTRODUCTION - Lines 21-25, 29-31 and 33-42 specify references to avoid plagiarism of other peoples work. Materials and methods - Indicate the GPRS location for the study site - State the Authorities of the procedures used in analysis of the measured parameters. RESULTS. - The tables for results should come immediately below the discussion and not after the references (Line 167-183) should be moved appropriately.	I ensure that the abstract is a representative of the whole paper in summary with all essential features All suggested line has been improved by authors Authorities of the procedures used in analysis of the measured parameters added in manuscript. The tables for results has been come immediately below the discussion
Minor REVISION comments	This article is fairly well written. English syntax errors have been detected in the text. Re-reading of the manuscript is recommended. This manuscript is recommended for minor revision.	Yes
Optional/General comments		