

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_130406
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Nutrient Management Technologies in Mustard under Irrigated Condition of Chandauli District, Uttar Pradesh
Type of the Article	Original Research 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: 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>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I like this manuscript because it not only examines the level of crop yield but also the economic value of the product. Also the phisico-chemical properties are analysed in this manuscript. So, this research will help the farmers for the cultivation and agricultural practices.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It would be more suitable if author added soil physico-chemical properties, yield and economics in the title. Ex.- "Impact of Nutrient Management Technologies on Soil physico-chemical properties, Yield and Economics of Mustard under Irrigated Condition of Chandauli District, Uttar Pradesh"	
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.	Yes	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The scientist names are not written in whole manuscript. Directly it is written in the references. Write proper scientist names and years in the place of numbers like [1], [2], [3], etc.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Write the scientist names and years in the place of numbers like [1], [2], [3], etc.</li> <li>2. Write proper words in the places of numbers like [1], [2], [3], etc.</li> <li>3. Give the table which one is mentioned in the 2.1 point of method and materials.</li> <li>4. 2.2 and 2.3 points are missing in method and materials.</li> <li>5. Give a table of yield in result and discussion.</li> </ol>	

### 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:	Anirban Sarkar
Department, University & Country	Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture, Technology and Sciences, India