

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_123923
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing the Impact of Sulfur, Magnesium, and Acepate on Mustard Crop Performance
Type of the Article	Research article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript on "Assessing the Impact of Sulfur, Magnesium, and Acepate on Mustard Crop Performance" is an important piece of work highlighting the importance of integrated nutrient and pest management on mustard crop production.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The journal guidelines clearly demanded a structured abstract with sub-headings...arrange accordingly</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Author's names and affiliations are missing</p> <p>Line numbering is missing</p> <p>References are not given in numbers as directed in journal's guidelines.</p> <p>Introduction is well-written.</p> <p>M & M: explain the treatments in detail. Full dosages of N, P and K????????-Plz give conc.</p> <p>Results: are well explained. Only slight detailing of treatments used should be given. Authors have given 7 tables. It is always better to represent data in graphical formats. Try to convert some tabular information into graphical form. Readers can have better idea from graphs rather than tables.</p> <p>Discussion is lacking. The authors have supported their results with previous findings but results are not discussed that why these increases or decreases are there? What could be the plausible reasons for that??? Whether it is due to some alterations in biochemical pathways or some other metabolic processes are involved. Kindly explain.</p> <p>Conclusion is quite lengthy.</p> <p>References: there are multiple references with name of Singh and Yadav (2024). Authors should give them as a,b,c.... Same is the case with Kumar et al (2023). Plz rectify.</p> <p>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS, COMPETING INTERESTS AND AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS ARE MISSING</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Yes, sufficient</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shilpa
Department, University & Country	Punjab Agricultural University, India