

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Annual Research &amp; Review in Biology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_ARRB_111899</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Response of mustard (Brassica juncea L.) to different bio-regulators under varying fertility levels</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original research article</b>

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<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)
<p><b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>yes</p> <p>yes</p> <p>yes, however it's too lengthy to be considered as abstract.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, but can be improved if the author follows the comments stated below.</p>	
<p><b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes, but there are grammatical and sentence errors observed in the manuscript that require correction. A comprehensive review to rectify these issues is necessary.</p>	
<p><b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The abstract exceeds the recommended length and requires further summarization. An effective abstract typically includes a concise introduction, brief descriptions of materials and methods, major findings, and a concluding remark. Kindly revise accordingly.</li> <li>• Numerous facts in the introduction lack supporting references. I recommend incorporating additional references to substantiate critical points and enhance the credibility of your paper.</li> <li>• In the materials and methods section, consider beginning with the geographical location before delving into treatments and application times, following a more structured sequence.</li> <li>• Ensure the inclusion of a detailed description of the statistical analysis used in the materials and methods section. Present the statistical results in the results and discussion section to strengthen the scientific rigor of your study.</li> <li>• For uniformity, use "L/ha" or "l/ha" instead of "lit/ha" when expressing liters per hectare.</li> <li>• Provide numerical discussions of your results rather than relying solely on descriptive analysis. This enhances clarity and precision.</li> <li>• While you mention that B<sub>3</sub> was the superior treatment, followed by B<sub>1</sub>, the marginal differences suggest statistical analysis may be beneficial. Consider incorporating statistical results to support your findings.</li> <li>• Strengthen your conclusion by highlighting additional noteworthy findings and outlining future research needs that have emerged from the study. This will enhance the overall impact and significance of your research.</li> </ul>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Laurence Shiva Sundar</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Fiji National University, Fiji</b>