

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_115512
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of Sulphur and Boron on growth and yield of Zaid Sunflower.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

## Review Form 1.7

### 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>The title of the work that was given to me for review is important as it establishes the effects of sulphur and boron on growth rate of sunflower.</p> <p>The title of the article may either be written as "Effects of sulphur and boron on growth and yield of zaid sunflower in Prayagraj, India". Or "Assessment of sulphur and boron on the growth rate of zaid sunflower in Prayagraj, India".</p> <p>No. The abstract lacks well- structured methods, improper presentation of results including. Inadequate conclusion.</p> <p>No. They should be properly structured. For instance, Abstract, Introduction, Materials and Methods, Statistical Analysis, Results, Discussion, Conclusion and References.</p> <p>Yes. If all corrections pointed out in the manuscript are done; the manuscript can be said to be scientifically correct. The references are not sufficient; 2008, 2010 and 2011 are not recent. Enumerate more recent references. You can use the latest edition of APA referencing. -In reference 2, write as Anjaiah, T. &amp; Jyothi, P. (2018). Then write out the page numbers. - Apply the above to reference 3, and write out the journal name in full. - Follow the same pattern for references 4 to 9, and write out the journal name in full where necessary.</p> <p>The <b>introduction</b> is not well-structured. -In line 5, under introduction, the reference Zobiola et al; is it Zobiola? Please, check and correct. - In lines 10 and 11, under introduction, what is the meaning of AP, UP and TamilNadu? Please, explain those terms. - In page 2, under introduction, line 25, Sharma <i>et al.</i> 2009 is not in the reference list</p> <p><b>Materials and Methods</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- In line 1, under materials and methods, 'the effect of S and B', write out the full meaning of S and B and minimize the use of abbreviations in research.</li><li>- From line 9, 'the soil... to line 12 (0.56 mg/kg); expunge and bring to the section under Results.</li><li>- After the section for materials and methods, the next subheading should be <b>Statistical analysis</b> followed by the <b>Results</b>. In this section Tables 1 and 2 including notable findings in the research should be considered. Please, note that the title for Table 2, should not be below the Table as shown in the manuscript, but under it. Please, expunge and correct. The next section is <b>Discussion</b>, then <b>Conclusion</b> and <b>References</b>.</li></ul> <p><b>Discussion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- All the findings expressed in the Results should be discussed simultaneously</li><li>- Words on the Tables columns, should be properly written for better understanding.</li><li>- The Tables were lacking in basic scientific unit of measurements.</li><li>-- The WHO standards or any other appropriate standards should be used to compare the results reported in the manuscripts.</li></ul> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>The conclusion is not comprehensive.</p>	<p>Okay</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Noted</p>

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes. If good sentence structures and paragraphing are maintained in the manuscript.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscripts can be published after careful corrections are made. <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- All the references cited in the body of the manuscript are also expected to be in the reference list.</li><li>- The author should follow the same pattern/ style of referencing. For example, Chicago style, APA style, etc.</li></ul>	

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)	