

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_124697
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of date of sowing in mustard (<i>Brassica juncea</i> L.) genotypes on seed growth and yield
Type of the Article	

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

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<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>It is well known that mustard requires low temperature for germination and early stage development. It is also well known that late sowing will lead to low productivity and low oil yield. The article is very casually written in bad English. Many sentences were even difficult to understand.</p> <p>Agronomic practices followed during the experiment including fertilizer dozes, irrigation etc. should be mentioned. Soil and atmospheric temperature during sowing should be mentioned.</p> <p>What quality parameters were studied? Methods are not mentioned. Methods and results for chlorophyll and oil content are not mentioned.</p> <p>Method and results not mentioned for stomatal conductance, photosynthetic rate.</p> <p>Use consistent format for presenting data. Either plant-1 or per plant</p> <p>Almost all sentences are having grammatical errors. Some lines were totally meaningless and difficult to understand.</p> <p>In the figures, the legends are overlapping and cluttered</p> <p>No error bars in charts.</p> <p>Why some parameters are given in table forms when others are represented by figures?</p> <p>The manuscript requires a thorough revision of both content and style. Authors shall rewrite the manuscript to meet scientific standards. Proofreading by a fluent English speaker or professional editor is highly recommended.</p> <p>SEE ATTACHMENT</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Title is not appropriate. The term seed germination may be used in place of seed growth.</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 abstract mentions that the study involves oil quality parameters but what quality parameters were studied?</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>The article discusses some already known facts. Hence it is not putting forward any new information.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>References given by authors are old. Authors should include new references to justify this study.</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No. The English language used in this article is substandard and not suited for publication.	
Optional/General comments	The article needs major revision to meet scientific standards.	

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:	M.S. Sujith Kumar
Department, University & Country	India