

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_IJPSS_118102
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of nutrient management on Indian mustard [Brassica juncea (L.)]: A review
Type of the Article	Review Article

Review Form 1.7

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript on the impact of nutrient management on mustard cultivation is indeed important for the scientific community, particularly for agricultural researchers and practitioners. It contributes valuable insights into optimizing nutrient management practices to enhance mustard crop yields and quality. By exploring the effects of different nutrient management strategies, the manuscript addresses a critical aspect of sustainable agriculture, aligning with current global concerns about food security and efficient resource utilization. 2. Yes, the title "Effect of nutrient management on Indian mustard [Brassica juncea (L.)]: A review" is suitable. It clearly indicates the focus of the article, which is to review the impact of nutrient management on Indian mustard (Brassica juncea). 3. Yes, the abstract is comprehensive. It effectively covers the main elements required in a scientific abstract: the purpose of the review, the scope of the study, the key findings, and the conclusion. It provides a clear and concise summary of the review's content, highlighting the benefits of integrated nutrient management in mustard cultivation. However, it could be slightly improved by mentioning the methodology for selecting studies and clearly separating the keywords section from the main abstract text. 4. Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The manuscript is organized in a logical manner, with each subsection addressing a specific aspect of nutrient management and its impact on Indian mustard. This clear structure helps in understanding the flow of information and the connections between different nutrient management practices and their outcomes on mustard cultivation. 5. Yes, the manuscript appears to be scientifically correct. It provides a detailed analysis of how different nutrient management strategies impact mustard cultivation, supported by relevant studies and data. The conclusions about the benefits of integrated nutrient management over inorganic fertilizers alone are well-founded and backed by scientific evidence. 6. The references provided in the manuscript are quite comprehensive and cover a wide range of studies related to nutrient management in Indian mustard cultivation. They include both recent publications and older studies, which add depth and historical context to the review. However, for further enhancement, the author could consider adding a few more recent references from the last 3-5 years to ensure that the review reflects the most current research trends and findings in the field of nutrient management for Indian mustard. Including recent publications would enhance the manuscript's relevance and credibility. <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct and provides a comprehensive review of the impact of various nutrient management practices on mustard cultivation. However, there are a few suggestions that could enhance its quality:</p> <p>The manuscript could benefit from a more detailed discussion on the potential challenges or limitations associated with the different nutrient management strategies discussed. Addressing these challenges and proposing potential solutions or areas for further research would enrich the review and provide a more holistic understanding for readers.</p> <p>Incorporating graphical representations such as graphs or tables would enhance the accessibility of complex data on plant growth attributes, nutrient uptake, and yield improvements under different nutrient management practices. These visual aids can significantly improve the reader's</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>understanding of the presented data. Additionally, a more detailed comparative analysis between various nutrient management strategies should be included, highlighting their respective strengths and limitations. This comparative approach would provide readers with valuable insights into the practical implications of the findings</p> <p>Additionally, including a section on future research directions or emerging trends in nutrient management for mustard cultivation could add value to the manuscript. This section could highlight areas that warrant further investigation or innovative approaches that could be explored to improve nutrient efficiency and sustainability in mustard production.</p> <p>Lastly, ensuring clarity and coherence in the flow of information throughout the manuscript, particularly in the discussion of results and their implications, would enhance the overall readability and impact of the review.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication. However, It would be beneficial to proofread the article for grammatical errors and to enhance readability and overall quality.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>It would be helpful to further refine the focus of the manuscript, ensuring that the abstract succinctly captures the key points and contributions of the study. Additionally, integrating more recent references, especially those from the last five years, could enhance the relevance and currency of the literature review.</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:	Helina Abera Molla
Department, University & Country	Dilla University, Ethiopia