

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_ACRI_118063
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of drought tolerance of two cultivars of Indian mustard (<i>Brassica juncea</i>) using morphological and physiological parameters
Type of the Article	

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>Compulsory 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>Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community. Research into the physiological and genetic mechanisms of plant resistance to drought is very important for agriculture.</p> <p>Yes, the title of the article is suitable. It is clear, concise, and informative. It accurately reflects the content of the paper.</p> <p>Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive. It provides a good overview of the research question, methodology, results, and implications of the study. The abstract is also well-written and easy to read.</p> <p>Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The manuscript is well-organized and easy to follow. The subsections are logical and informative.</p> <p>Yes, I think the manuscript is scientifically correct. The methodology is sound, and the results are presented in a clear and concise manner. The authors also discuss the limitations of their study and suggest directions for future research.</p> <p>Yes, the references are sufficient and recent.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the language quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alexander Kurovsky
Department, University & Country	National Research Tomsk State University, Russia