

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_95270
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Various levels of Phosphorus and Sulphur on Growth and Interaction of Toria (Brassica campestris) in Mid Hill Zone of Himachal Pradesh
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> )

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The manuscript has scientific base so, it may be helped for scientific community. This may be specially helped for agronomist.</li> <li>The title is appropriate for the manuscript.</li> <li>The abstract is comprehensive.</li> <li>The subsection and structure is appropriate with the manuscript.</li> <li>I hope the manuscript is scientifically correct.</li> <li>References are not sufficient and more and recent reference may be cited here.</li> </ol> <p>In addition to the above comments the material and methods should be understandable as indicated in red marking. In addition to this in the results section author should place justification as indicate in red marking.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>	The language of the article is scholarly communicable.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	After correction as indicated by reviewer comments the manuscript may be acceptable.	

### 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:	Dharmeswar Barman
Department, University & Country	Goalpara College, India