

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_86199
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Nitrogen and Sulphur on Yield and Economics of Mustard [Brassica juncea (L.)]
Type of the Article	Original 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:

(<https://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>)

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	<p>The manuscript is interesting, however, there are many points that must be clarified to make it replicable, including statistical procedures and analysis. The document is well written, but a revision is needed particularly in the materials and methods, results, and discussion part.</p> <p>Below, I include general comments that must be addressed. In addition, I have some questions that need to be solved and addressed to improve the quality of this work.</p> <p>General comments:</p> <p>The manuscript must include a good justification to study the Effect of Nitrogen and Sulfur on the Yield and Economy of Mustard [Brassica juncea (L.)], due to, no previous study is mentioned in that region.</p> <p>It is necessary to look for the most up-to-date references, no more than 10 years old, this applies to the entire document.</p> <p>The discussion would be greatly enriched if information from similar works were included.</p> <p>Missing references in the introduction and discussion section to improve and enrich the work.</p> <p>It remains to mention the dimensions of the experimental field, including the number of experimental units per treatment.</p> <p>The experimental design does not include a control treatment.</p> <p>It is necessary to specify all the instruments that were used to evaluate the established variables.</p> <p>The discussion of the results make no mention of the tables</p> <p>The conclusion must be clear and precise.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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)	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Marcos Alfonso Lastiri Hernández
Department, University & Country	Instituto Politécnico Nacional-CIIDIR-IPN Unidad, México