

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_112873
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of different sources and levels of Sulphur in Sesame on Yield, Nutrient uptake and Soil fertility in acid Alfisols of Odisha
Type of the Article	

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy>)

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The title and abstract are acceptable.</p> <p>However major issues in the manuscript include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The objective/ thesis statement is missing under the introduction. 2. In lines 125- 126, the author(s) wrote, "application of S for two years in a row significantly elevated the oil content of sesame". Was the study repeated over two years? The duration of the study and application of treatments over the two years is not clearly outlined under methods. It is difficult for other researchers to repeat this experiment. 3. The presentation and interpretation of yield and yield components results (Tables 2-4) are incomplete. Each table should indicate (1) The Effect of S levels on yield (2) The Effect of different S sources on yield, and (3) The Interactive effect of S levels and S sources on yield. 4. The discussion is very shallow with many old sources. <p>Complete comments are inserted in the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language needs much improvement.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kuume Benjamin Pendapala Enguwa
Department, University & Country	Crop Production and Agricultural Technologies University of Namibia (UNAM), Namibia