

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_110816
Title of the Manuscript:	Yield Gap Analysis and Impact Assessment of Rapeseed- Mustard through Cluster Front Line Demonstrations in Khowai District of Tripura, India
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	While the manuscript carries significant importance within the scientific community, I do have the following comments for the author. The title of the article is good. I have listed my comments for the author as follows; 1) The contribution of the study is not mentioned in the abstract. I suggest that the author indicate the study's contribution and provide suggestions for policymakers. 2) The author did not discuss the objective and research problem in detail. I suggest that the author discuss the major objective, and research gap and discuss them in detail. 3) The paper is quite short, and I suggest that the author add more relevant ideas to expand its content and increase the page number. 4) In the table above, the result and discussion section is labeled as 'List 1: Details of recommended practices and existing practices under field pea FLD.' I suggest that the author revise the label/name. 5) Overall, the paper is too short. I suggest that the author revise (the introduction, literature, materials and methods, results, and conclusions) of the paper. 6) Proofreading is required	Mentioned in abstract section. Discuss in the Introduction section. Added Revised Revised Yes
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is good; however, everything is concise, making it difficult to grasp the overall concept of the paper.	
Optional/General comments	In my opinion, the paper needs major revisions.	

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)	