

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_125028
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of different nutrient management practices on growth and yield of mustard (Brassica Juncea L.)
Type of the Article	Research article

## Review Form 3

### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	Mustard is a nutrient-demanding crop, particularly requiring nitrogen, phosphorus, potassium, and sulfur. Improper nutrient management can deplete soil fertility, affecting crop yields over time. This manuscript is important for arid region like Rajasthan with many challenges like limited water availability and extreme temperature. Effective nutrient management enhances the water use efficiency of mustard, enabling the crop to better cope with stress conditions and maintain stable yields despite changing climatic factors.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	<b>Title may be changed.</b>  Alternate title:- Nutrient Management for Enhancing Growth and Yield of Mustard (Brassica juncea L.) in Rajasthan	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	<b>Yes, it is comprehensive. But language can be changed. One or two points may be added on relevance of this topic in respect to the crop as well as the region.</b>	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	<b>Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate</b>	
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	<b>This manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound because it follows a well-structured experimental design, specifically a randomized block design with replications, which ensures the reliability and reproducibility of the results. The selection of multiple treatments, including control and varying combinations of nutrients, allows for a comprehensive comparison of their effects on mustard growth and yield, making the conclusions more reliable. Furthermore, the inclusion of essential growth and yield parameters, such as plant height, siliqua length, and yield components, provides a thorough evaluation of how different nutrient management practices impact crop performance. Additionally, the manuscript references previous studies, supporting its findings and establishing its relevance in the context of existing research.</b>	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	<b>References should be recent years. It seems that most of the references are old. So, authors should use references from recent year</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language/English quality of the article should be improved. There are few grammatical mistakes were found	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound</li> <li>2. The discussion part is not sufficient.</li> <li>3. The author should clearly mention the actual reason why treatment T6 showed the best result</li> <li>4. The authors should use references from recent year</li> </ol>	

**Review Form 3**

**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>Arunima Gogoi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Assam Agricultural University, India</b>