

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_105619
Title of the Manuscript:	An appraisal of technological interventions on mustard crop under Cluster Front Line Demonstrations
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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes it is</p> <p>2. Yes it is suitable</p> <p>3. No.... it lacks research design and significance of the study</p> <p>4. No----methodology misses important subsections (see in write-up) -----missing; study recommendations and declaration of conflict of interest</p> <p>5. A good idea which needs to be refined</p> <p>6. Most references are TOO OLD.... Such as (Panday <i>et al.</i>, 1999; Choudhary, 1999) and many more</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Tables are ALWAYS labelled from the top Figures are ALWAYS labelled from the bottom</p>	

Comment [WU1]: Too old citation

Comment [WU2]: Too old citation

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Charles Nyarang'o Nyamwamu
Department, University & Country	University of Eldoret, Kenya