

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_100437
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of Sulphur and Spacing on Yield and Economics of Toria (<i>Brassica campestris</i> L.)
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes, it is important but, the treatment combinations selected here i.e., S levels & spacing has less significance in real world problem. Can the author justify the problem ? It may be "Influence of S nutrition in Toria under different crop geometry" Minor corrections needed in the abstract sections (Marked in the manuscript) Yes, if possible one graphical result might be included. Interaction has not been studied here, suitable design might be factorial or Split-plot design. Can the author justify why RBD has been taken here ? Recent references regarding discussion part is missing Detailing in the manuscript is missing.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	As mentioned earlier, scientific detailing in the manuscript is missing, which should be re-checked.	
Optional/General comments	Highlighted some wrong parts, which need to be changed.	

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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jagadish Jena
Department, University & Country	Siksha 'O' Anusandhan University, India