

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_94676
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Sulphur, Potassium and PSB on Growth Parameters, Root Architecture and Quality of Mustard (Brassica juncea L.)
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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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	<p>In abstract:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1)The concept of PSB should be written. 2)The difference in the results of years after the review should be mentioned. <p>In introduction:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The information related to the role of sulfur and potassium should be added using newer sources. 2) The goal or objectives of the project should be mentioned. <p>In materials and methods:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1)The characteristics of the soil in the first and second year before cultivation should be stated more clearly. 2)Table 1: The meaning of the numbers 20, 40 and 60 in sulfur and potassium should be stated in the footer of the table. 3) State the sources of potassium and sulfur fertilizers as well as the amount of PSB consumed. 4) The irrigation status or the amount of rainfall during the growth period (for both years) should be mentioned. <p>In the results and discussion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The variance analysis table should be added along with the statistical comparison of two years. 2) In tables number 3 and 4, while correcting the table number in the text, make a statistical comparison between the results of the first and second years. 3) It is necessary to discuss more (in other words, no discussion was done). <p>In conclusion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) After doing the above, it should be written more completely. <p>References:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Newer (last 5 years) and related sources should be added. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	M. A. Bahmanyar
Department, University & Country	Sari Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources University, Iran