

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_126145
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of Integrated nutrient management on growth, development and yield contributing characters of Indian mustard (<i>Brassica juncea</i> L.) under Doon valley condition of Uttarakhand
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The Manuscript contains new information; the Title corresponds to the content. The introduction reflects the content of the problem in the substantiation of the work, the literature reflects the world level of the study of the problem. The methods are described quite fully. Keywords are terms that facilitate bibliographic searches that are NOT used in the title. The authors have observed this.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title corresponds to the content	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract includes a description of the main topic, problem, object, purpose of the work and its results. It indicates what is new in this document in comparison with others that are related in topic and purpose. Keywords: It is better to give the abbreviations in full. <i>FYM</i> , <i>RDF</i> . Growth of what?	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The authors built the structure of the Article traditionally. Introduction about the research topic. The purpose of scientific research. Description of the scientific and practical significance of the work. Description of the research methodology. The main results, conclusions of the research work.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The results of the work should be described extremely accurately and informatively. The main theoretical and experimental results, actual data, detected interactions and patterns are presented. In doing so, preference is given to new results, important discoveries, conclusions that refute existing theories, as well as data of practical significance. CONCLUSION requires refinement	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	REFERENCES includes works on the subject of the Manuscript. There are enough of them.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The quality of the English language of the article, suitable for scientific communication.	
Optional/General comments	The Manuscript can be recommended for publication after some revision. But the Manuscript contains many errors in formatting (starting from double spaces, unnecessary commas at the end (see Abstract), etc.	

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:	Lisetskii Fedo
Department, University & Country	Belgorod State National Research University, Russia