



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Journal Name: | International Journal of Plant & Soil Science |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_IJPSS_21617 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Effect of brassinolide on the growth of mustard crops grown in semi-arid tropics of Nizamabad |
| Type of the 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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) |
|--------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments | A very good topic indeed, however the author did not fully took advantage of the fact that he/she is dealing with something new and valuable. The entire approach was not up to standard starting from the abstract down to the conclusion. The materials and methods section is very weak and could be very difficult if not possible for someone to repeat the study. The author have failed dismally to show on how did he/she measured the studied parameters. The results and discussion sections were the weakest link of the entire study. Rather, the author have dwell much on some other peoples' findings instead of him/her explaining his/her findings. All these have weakened the entire work and render it unacceptable in the field of science. However, the study can be rectified if and only if the author concentrate on the queries that were raised by the reviewer and also seek help from the experienced researchers. | The author modified the paper and submitted to the editor |
| <u>Minor</u> REVISION comments | | |
| <u>Optional/General</u> comments | | |