



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_44529
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF SULPHUR AND BORON LEVELS ON SOIL AVAILABLE NUTRIENTS AFTER HARVEST OF SESAMUM (SESAMUM INDICUM L.) IN RED SOIL OF MIRZAPUR
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>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's response
Compulsory REVISION comments	Although the purpose of the research is extremely interesting, writing is extremely confusing.	Necessary incorporation of literature has been done.
	Title: Does not match the abstract or the purpose presented at the end of the introduction.	Minor change in title is done and some changes in abstract are also done.
	Introduction: Very needy, requiring more literature review. It says very little about sulphur and boron (actually it says the basics) and says nothing about culture. It also does not report the relation of this culture to the fertility of the soil nor its relation with the sulfur and the boron.	Boron and sulphur related literature is incorporated in introduction part.
	Material and methods: Little detailed, making it very difficult to understand.	Some necessary modification is done
	Results and discussion: The results and discussion were presented very poorly. There was virtually no discussion of the results. The work is poor both in results and discussion. It needs extensive literature review with the aim of improving and greatly the article.	Some new necessary review and literature are added in results and discussion part to strengthen this section.
	Conclusion: Very poor.	Conclusion is modified
Minor REVISION comments	It needs more discussion of the results, besides improving the literature review.	Incorporated as per the directions
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The idea of the article is very interesting, but unfortunately, lacked a more detailed writing, including addressing the importance of the work.	Detailed discussion is incorporated.