



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	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:

(<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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Authors have shown the growth promoting effect of BL on mustard plants growing in saline land black soil. Although enhancement in the foliar growth by BL application, which is already documented in a number of previous studies, has been shown, lack of molecular physiological evidences obscures the importance of the current study. Further, I am surprised that why authors have not extended the study to the level of plant yield in terms of seed number and quality, which is actually highly desirable. The attempt is good, however, the present standing of the manuscript doesn't have a strong standing for publication and requires a major revision. I have highlighted few of my concern below</p> <p>Major Points</p> <p>#In Line 9-11 of abstract: "BL mitigated the negative effect of the semi-arid conditions" – Evidently, BL in general has a growth promoting effect in plants so without any solid experimental proof (molecular, physiological) it is very early to say that it negate the effect of semi-arid conditions.</p> <p>#In Line 34 – 36: Authors have stated that the semi-arid condition in Nizamabad poses a threat to the overall yield of the plants but have not cited any reference. Also, this has not been shown experimentally in the manuscript. What do you mean by Yield? Is it the seed output in case of mustard or grain number and quality in cereals? Citations for such important sentences are indispensable.</p> <p>#I think information in introduction should be corroborated with solid experimental plan in the</p>	<p>#In Line 9-11: The authors are saying that the shoot and root fresh growth, diameter as well as length are improved by application of BL.</p> <p>The experiment was done to show the growth of plants in Nizamabad district. If the soil has to be procured from other districts of Telangana State, it would be a tedious job.</p> <p>Line 30: the review article describes the effect of BRs on various physiological processes and hence <u>Seed germination</u> and <u>senescence</u> are written.</p> <p>Line 23 : BR- signaling plays a positive in plant growth, <u>Role</u> is added.</p> <p>Line 38 <u>through</u> is replaced by <u>throughout</u>.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>manuscript. I suggest, either remove information on yield from the introduction or add experiments showing effect of BL also on yield of mustard plants.</p> <p># Experiment should include a set up where mustard plants grown in pots containing favorable soil are compared with the one growing in saline land black soil. Adding such control would enhance the overall impact of the study.</p> <p>#Data given in the tables <u>should be</u> represented by bar graphs with standard errors as well.</p> <p>#Photographs of the control and treated plants should be included in the manuscript.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>#In Line 30: <u>Seed germination</u> and <u>senescence</u> should be excluded from the sentence as these are repeated and not in compliance with the former sentence.</p> <p># InLine 23 : BR- signaling plays a positive in plant growth, <u>Role</u> is missing. Similarly, in Line 38 <u>through</u> should be replaced by <u>throughout</u>.</p> <p># There are several such issues in the present manuscript structure, I suggest that the MS structure/English should be extensively revised.</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		