

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Agriculture</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_126732
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Sulphur and Zinc on Growth and Yield of Indian Mustard [Brassica juncea (L.).]"
Type of the Article	Research 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

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (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.	Abstract and Results and discussion part is lacking clarity and poor writing. Rewrite those sections	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Effect of Sulphur and Zinc on Growth and Yield attributes and Profitability of Indian Mustard [ <i>Brassica juncea</i> (L.)]	
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 results has to be properly re-written by including the data which was on par with the highest recorded values.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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 article will be beneficial to the further studies.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	1. There is no need of figures or illustration. If so, they can compare with yield and economics. 2. Need to rewrite the article as per the suggestions	

#### PART 2:

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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:	M V Priya
Department, University & Country	Acharya N G Ranga Agricultural University, India