



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_43605
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of nitrogen levels on mustard (<i>Brassica juncea</i> (L.) Czern and Coss.) varieties under late sown condition
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:

(<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	The manuscript is accepted with minor changes. It has scientific quality and statistical support, the parameters evaluated are adequate. Each section is complete. However little errors were founded during the revision. Title: Is ok Abstract: Is ok, only write organic carbon and three replications. Introduction: Add the importance of mustard production in India (annual production, yield, acreage and production value. Line 17. Write Eastern. Line 30. Reference Keivanrad and Zandi is 2004 or 2012. Materials and Methods: It's complete. Add information about agronomic characteristics of three varieties used in this study (NDR-8510, Vardan and Maya). Line 69. Write Vardan and Maya. Line 70. Write three. Line 92. Write harvest. Line 76. Write Days after sowing (DAS) only the first time. Results and discussion: Are complete and precise. Line 159. Reference Sah et al is 2006 or 2015. Line 165. Reference Parmindar and Sandhu or Parmindar and Sindhu. Table 3 and 4. Write the name of each variety not V1, V2 and V3. Improve Table 4 and Table 5. Conclusion: Is ok Reference: The reference Kumar et al, 2010 and Singh and Singh, 2004. Are lacking inside manuscripts The reference Woldeyesus et al., 2004 and Fisher and Yates. Are Lacking in the reference list.	Dear sir, i correct all the part you give to correction. I am I correct estarn to Eastern By mistake i write 2004. That is 2012 I add all information about all varieties that was i taken for experiment Correct all Correct
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link: <http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>