

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_96998
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance of salicylic acid and hydrogel on water use efficiency, and productivity of Indian mustard (<i>Brassica juncea</i> L.) in Jammu region
Type of the Article	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>)

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"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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"> It is important to the scientific community. It is suitable It isn't written as per the journal style More to be done It is okay but more to be done. Scientifically, it makes a sense of it all. But it needs to be rewritten to bring the beauty of its contents out to the wider readers. Nine references are inadequate. More so, two 1998 references are too old in 2023. It could be replaced with recent references in this field of research. <p>Title of the manuscript: It is self-explanative.</p> <p>Abstract: It is to be recast. Comments and correctives to be done are pointed out in it.</p> <p>Keywords: Keywords are okay.</p> <p>Introduction: The introduction is punctured with long sentences with grammatical errors. Just so you know, action to be taken is advised in it.</p> <p>References cited in the text: References in the text</p> <p>Materials and methods: The materials and method section is to be recast. It isn't explicit enough and written up stepwise enough for ease of understanding for wider viewers</p> <p>Results: Under the results and discussion, each parameter's effect, and its discussion ought to go hand in hand or <i>pari passu</i>. This makes it more understandable.</p> <p>Discussion: It was pretty done. It is to be rearranged parameter-wise</p> <p>Conclusion. This conclusion isn't comprehensible enough. Using a sentence for it isn't good at all. It should be broken down into sentences by points for ease of assimilation.</p> <p>List of references: Not written as per the journal style.</p> <p>The words in the red ink are to be corrected. The words in yellow ink are reviewer comments The words in blue ink are alternative suggestions by the reviewer.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The English language is good enough exception of a few punctuations, and long sentences that are punctured with grammatical errors.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>It is a well-structured research work. It gives value to its usage, and the production of Indian mustard at global stage. It can be published if all the major corrections are done as referred.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Peter Shaba
Department, University & Country	College of Agriculture, Nigeria