

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_96512
Title of the Manuscript:	Productivity, white rust and Alternaria blight of Indian mustard influenced by chemical fungicide seed treatment under humid southeastern Agro-climatic zone of Rajasthan, India
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.journalcjust.com/index.php/CJAST/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)	This paper has a potential to be accepted, but there are some important points have to be clarified or fixed (a correction to a typographic, spelling, or grammatical mistake) before we can proceed and a positive action can be taken. yes yes yes yes There are several facts mentioned by the authors in the discussion part need to be supported by references. I have indicated them on the manuscript	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Not very well	
Optional/General comments	See the attachment	

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:	Mohammed Hussein Minati
Department, University & Country	Iraq