

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | International Journal of Plant & Soil Science |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_IJPSS_98555 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Influence of nutrients management on growth and yield of Gobhi sarson (<i>Brassica napus</i> spp. <i>napus</i>) under mid hill region of Himachal Pradesh |
| Type of the 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) | <p>Yes, especially for the mid hill regions, but the discussion should be directed to that kind of area of rapeseed production.</p> <p>Yes, but still need some revisions.</p> <p>No, it needs to be revised to make it comprehensive.</p> <p>Yes, but more comprehensive discussion is needed, and there should be a general discussion to relate all the subsections at the end.</p> <p>Yes, I think so, just the data analysis, interpretation and the discussion need to be written in a more comprehensive way.</p> <p>Yes, but the referencing style need to be revised.</p> | |
| Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Still needs some improvements, but I have made a heavy editing on the manuscript | |
| Optional/General comments | In general, this paper needs to be better written to meet the sense of scientific paper. The Methods have to be clear and very comprehensive so that others can repeat the experiment to prove the results. | |

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: | Wayan Wangiyana |
| Department, University & Country | University of Mataram, Indonesia |