



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_43593
Title of the Manuscript:	Oil yield and quality of Indian mustard (Brassica juncea L.) as influenced by organic manures and biofertilizers
Type of the 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	<p>Introduction: The introduction does not adequately expose the context of the work, cites only a very old bibliographical reference and information in other paragraphs missing reference.</p> <p>Matherial and methods</p> <p>Raise the geographic coordinates of the experiment. Explain what "two factors viz." Means. Write in full the first time the RDF terms appear; FYM; PSB; How was the Vermicompost made or is it commercial? As for the methods lacked a brief description of each (how the samples were prepared, reagents ..., since they were only referenced with references quite old. What was the statistical program used to treat the data?</p> <p>Discussion: Since the statistical data were not presented correctly in the tables, since the comparison of means for all the variables is lacking, it is very difficult to analyze the affirmations made as to the greater or lesser result. References cited to compare results are also very old and should be reviewed. I suggest that in the table add the standard deviation next to each result and the letters comparing the averages, p value at the end of the table. I think it would be possible to do some analysis of interaction between the variables, because in lines 112 and 113 there is an interaction conclusion. Table 1. Treatment 8 is the oil yield result correct? What SE and CD mean in the tables, put below the meaning. Table 4 and table 5 - SE (m) was not filled. A final conclusion of the article is missing. 100% of references have more than five years.</p>	Noted.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		