

Review form 1.7

Journal name:	International Journal of Plant and Soil Sciences
Manuscript number:	Mrs_IJPSS_104653
Manuscript Title:	Economic dimensions of mustard cultivation under sprinkler irrigation in South Haryana
Item Type	

General guideline for the peer review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that NO manuscript should be rejected solely on the basis of "lack of novelty", as long as the manuscript is scientifically sound and technically sound. For the complete guide to the peer review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://www.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy>

Review form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	reviewer comment	Author comment (if you agree with the reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. Authors are required to write their comments here)
<p>Mandatory REVIEW Feedback</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important to the scientific community? (Please write a few sentences in this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article appropriate? (If not, please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article complete?</p> <p>4. Are the 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 any suggestions for additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Other than the 6 points mentioned above, reviewers can provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript reveals:</p> <p>The keywords must be worked with the THESAURUS OF UNESCO, which is a universal glossary that locates the study within a specific spectrum of sciences; In addition, it facilitates its development and location when it has been published: Agriculture – Cultivation – Economy - Mustard...</p> <p>The problem of water as a scarce input is correctly justified.</p> <p>The place of the investigation is not contextualized; the experimental design by blocks in different stages is feasible for this study; the formula and the tools proposed for reading the results are adequate.</p> <p>The unit system for reading results is appropriate; the results are compared with two specific studies on the subject; The findings show differentiated costs in terms of the irrigation system between the different districts. It would be important to establish new lines of research that complement these results.</p> <p>In the absence of the objective of the study, the conclusion cannot be appraised.</p> <p>2. The title proposed for the research is appropriate</p> <p>3. It is important to determine the objective of the investigation. The methodology, design and results are relevant. It is necessary to indicate the conclusions of the study.</p> <p>4. The structure is appropriate for this scientific study</p> <p>5. The manuscript scientifically contains weakness in its references.</p> <p>6. The references are very weak to support all this study, it is suggested that they are at least between 30 - 50</p>	
<p>Minor REVIEW Feedback</p> <p>1. Is the quality of the language/English of the article adequate for scholarly communications?</p>	adequate	
Optional/General comments		

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jeverson Santiago Quishpe Gaibor
Department, University & Country	Salesian Polytechnic University, Ecuador