

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_87034
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Boron and sulphur on growth, yield of mustard ( <i>Brassica juncea</i> L.)
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	The abstract does not comply with the necessary data that summarizes the work, important data and conclusions are missing ( <a href="https://journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/about/submissions#authorGuidelines">https://journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/about/submissions#authorGuidelines</a> ) Symbols are used without indicating their meaning. The data given in the characterization of the soil is not clear if they were made or how they were obtained. It is mentioned in the methodology section that 4 experimental levels were carried out but only 3 have been reported. The tables do not show the standard deviation of the replications indicated in the methodology, annotations without meaning are used below the tables and this manuscript does not show the statistical treatment used, the software used is not indicated. The discussion of the results is very poor and scarce as well as the values found are not used to compare with the reviewed articles. The references used are few, this being a highly studied topic and the most recent is from 2016, it should be used more current and in a larger volume of paper.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	I consider it is a work that should be improved for a publication, an adequate discussion of results should be made and evidence of the statistical treatment, as well as improving the writing of the writing	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Dolores Castañeda Antonio
Department, University & Country	Meritorious Autonomous University of Puebla, Mexico