

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_116058
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of nitrogen and sulphur on growth and yield of mustard (<i>Brassica juncea</i> L.)
Type of the 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. Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community as it highlights the effect of N and S on the growth and yield of mustard. 2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable. 3. The abstract is comprehensive but needs modification. 4. The structure of the manuscript is appropriate but it lacks to include subsections. 5. Yes, the manuscript seems scientifically correct if appropriate corrections and revisions are made based on the comments. 6. The references are not sufficient; very limited references have been used. <p>The manuscript is good in terms of containing scientific results but it significantly lacks proper writing and proper interpretation, analysis, and discussion of results. The 'introduction' and the 'materials and methods' sections are written as a single paragraph each with low English quality. The flow of idea is also not good in the introduction part. The experimental design is not presented in the materials and methods section. There is not reason why the author(s) selected the ranges of the values of the factors (N and S doses).</p> <p>The way results and discussion section has been written is very bad. There is not interpretation and analysis of results at all, rather mere reporting of what has been obtained from the experiments. The author(s) did not try to set the scientific reasons for the increments in the responses for increases I the doses of N and S. They used design experimemnt software to set the experiments but they did not use any statistical analysis software for analysing and interpreting the results. They could do one more computation: the percentage increament on the responses from the control to the maximum doses of N and S. For instance, the plant height increased by about 13% when the N dose was increased from 0 to 160 Kg/ha, and by about 16.5% for sulphur; number of branches by 16.5% for N and by 13% for S; ... They also have to reason out why there is difference in effect between N and S.</p> <p>Similarly, they could calculate the percentage increments in the different yields (table 2) and discuss the results. For instance, the biological yield increased by about 33% for N an d20% for S; seed yield by 38.7% for N and 22.7% for S; stover yield by 31.3% for N and 19.5 % for S; harvest index by 4.4% for N and 2% for S. Why N has more significant effect compared to S in all the parameters stated above (check the percentage values for each)? They should discuss this too in detail.</p> <p>The conclusion is not in fact a conclusion. They should re-write it!</p> <p>Overall, the manuscript needs serious revision!!!</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The language/English quality is very poor and not suitable for scholarly communications. The manuscript needs very major improvement in this aspect! 	
<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:	Zenamarkos Bantie Sendekie
Department, University & Country	Bahir Dar Institute of Technology, Bahir Dar University, Ethiopia