

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_126916
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of nitrogen and boron fertilization on yield and quality of Mustard crop in Chitrakoot area
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>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	This manuscript holds significant importance for the scientific community as it addresses the impact of nitrogen and boron fertilization on mustard yield and oil quality, offering valuable insights for sustainable crop management. By incorporating nano-urea and boron applications, the study highlights a novel approach that enhances nutrient efficiency while also boosting yield and oil content—critical goals in modern agriculture. I appreciate how the manuscript provides a well-structured comparison of various treatments, showcasing the optimal combination for maximizing mustard productivity in semi-arid regions. This research has the potential to inform future studies and guide farmers in adopting environmentally friendly practices that improve crop output.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title, "Effect of Nitrogen and Boron Fertilization on Yield and Quality of Mustard Crop in Chitrakoot Area," is suitable but could be slightly refined for clarity and precision. A more concise and informative alternative might be: "Impact of Nitrogen and Boron Fertilization on Yield and Oil Quality of Mustard (<i>Brassica juncea</i>) in Semi-Arid Chitrakoot, India" This revised title emphasizes the focus on both yield and oil quality, specifies the mustard species, and includes the study region's climate type, making it more appealing to a broader scientific audience.	
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 is comprehensive, covering the study's main objectives, methodology, key findings, and conclusion. However, it could be improved by briefly mentioning the importance of mustard as a crop in India, as well as the potential practical applications of the study's findings. Here are a few suggestions for improvement: 1. Add Context: A sentence about the significance of mustard for the Indian agriculture sector would help readers understand why improving its yield and oil quality is important. 2. Methodology Clarity: Specify the duration of the experiment, or clarify if it was over a single growing season, to give context to the results. 3. Highlight Practical Applications: A brief statement about how these findings could influence fertilizer practices or crop management in semi-arid regions would enhance the abstract's relevance for a practical audience. 4. Remove Excessive Details: Some details about low-yield treatments (such as T11) might be removed or briefly summarized, as this section is more relevant for the main text. Overall, these adjustments would make the abstract more accessible and focused on the broader implications of the research.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript's subsections and structure are generally appropriate and follow a logical progression, which aids in clarity and readability. The sections—such as Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results, Discussion, and Conclusion—are effectively organized to guide the reader through the study's context, methodology, findings, and implications. Each section supports a focused and coherent narrative, enhancing the manuscript's scientific rigor.	

Review Form 3

	<p>However, a few improvements could be considered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Combine Results and Discussion: If space permits, integrating the Results and Discussion sections could improve readability by allowing immediate interpretation of findings. Otherwise, ensure that the Results section stays descriptive, with deeper analysis in the Discussion. 2. Add a Practical Applications Subsection: Including a short subsection on the practical implications of the findings, either within the Discussion or as a standalone section, would help highlight the study's value to agronomists and farmers. 3. Streamline Data Presentation: Consider including summary tables or concise bullet points for complex data to enhance clarity in sections with extensive details. <p>Overall, the manuscript's structure is solid, but minor adjustments could strengthen its readability and practical relevance.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound, as it follows standard research protocols and provides thorough explanations of the methodology, which enhances reproducibility. The data presented are comprehensive, and the analysis is conducted rigorously, using appropriate statistical methods to support the findings. Furthermore, the study builds upon a strong foundation of existing literature, indicating a deep understanding of the current scientific landscape. This careful approach to experimentation and data analysis reinforces the manuscript's credibility and potential impact on the field.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>=</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript are generally relevant, but there are some older citations that could be supplemented with more recent studies to provide an updated context, particularly regarding the advancements in nano-urea and boron application methods. Integrating newer research published within the last 3–5 years would enhance the manuscript's relevance, especially studies focusing on recent innovations in nano-fertilizer efficacy and nutrient use efficiency in oilseed crops. These additions would strengthen the literature review and support the manuscript's discussion of current trends in nutrient management.</p>	
<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the article is mostly suitable for scholarly communication, as it effectively conveys the main ideas and findings. However, there are areas where sentence structure and word choice could be refined to improve clarity and readability. Some technical terms could also be explained in more detail to ensure accessibility for a broader scientific audience. Minor grammatical adjustments would further enhance the manuscript's readability and polish, making it fully appropriate for scholarly publication.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Examine the references section; there is an issue with the font size.</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Garima Pathak
Department, University & Country	B.D.College, Patliputra University, India