

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEAI_120011</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of different sowing dates and establishment methods on growth, yield and economics of Mustard (Brassica Juncea L.)</b>
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.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/editorial-policy> )

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**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><b>Compulsory</b> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. As a new research, it is important for the scientific community. Any new knowledge is important for the scientific community. New technologies are a major concern to improve productivity in crops, the results of this research could contribute to increase mustard productivity.</p> <p>2. The title is suitable for the manuscript</p> <p>3. Abstract is mostly comprehensive but need to do some corrections</p> <p>4. Yes, subsections and structure are adequate</p> <p>5. The manuscript requires more work to be scientifically correct</p> <p>6. More references will strong the manuscript</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>English language is ok, however requires editing.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>It is a good research, with lots of works. However, many ideas are repetitive in introduction; this section requires organization. The part of results and discussion, there is no really discussion, just saying this finding is similar to... but why?</p>	

**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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	<p>NA</p>

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Nadiezhdha Ramirez-Cabral
Department, University & Country	Mexico