

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_102144</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of Potassium &amp; Zinc on the Yield attributes and Economics of Mustard (Brassica juncea L.)</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### 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><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>This study shows the effect of potassium and zinc on mustard plants; indicates the dosage of both elements and the favorable economics at that dose.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>The title of the article is suitable.</b></li> <li><b>The abstract of the article is uncomprehensive.</b></li> <li><b>Subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</b></li> <li><b>I think the manuscript is scientifically correct</b></li> <li><b>The references are not sufficient and recent.</b> Add the latest references; the last five years as many as five to ten papers</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p><b>The language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly.</b></p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

### 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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Warji</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universitas Lampung, Indonesia</b>