

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_97602</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Conservation Agriculture for Sustainable Agriculture</b>
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:

(<https://www.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<p><b>Compulsory REVISION comments</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p><b>Abstract:</b>            -Authors can state the full meaning of CA first before using the abbreviated format.            -The main aim/objective of this study is unknown or clear in the abstract. Authors need to state the main clearly in the initial part of the abstract.            -Again, the techniques/method used in analyzing or reviewing extant literature highlighted in this synthesis report or study must be integrated or highlighted briefly in a sentence or two in the abstract (i.e., content analysis, SLR approach and so on).            -The abstract should have a concluding sentence which highlight the study's relevance or contribution to literature or emerging body of knowledge</p> <p><b>Introduction:</b>            -Research progress in relation to other similar review studies should be integrated to enrich the introduction.            -authors can integrate some guiding concepts or theories linked to ecosystem based approaches and sustainable development to enrich the introduction.            -What this study sought or attempted to address needs to be made clear in the last paragraph of the introduction.            -The study's importance to key players must also be highlighted briefly also.</p> <p><b>Methods:</b>            -Source of data extraction or acquisition/databases and the mode of analysing them must be integrated or highlighted.            -Thus, the techniques/method used in analyzing or reviewing extant literature highlighted in this synthesis report or study must be integrated or highlighted or explained (i.e., content analysis, SLR approach and so on).</p> <p><b>Figure 1:</b> Figure 1 needs an appropriate caption and the source and yet to be given caption must be separated from the image.</p> <p>-Authors need to restructure the sections for consistency. It is unclear what the methods used to analyze or data source is. Again, it is also unclear what the study's results are though it is obvious this is a review study or synthesis report. Hence, authors need to highlight the strengths, weaknesses and opportunities in conservative agriculture and conventional approaches used where necessary.</p> <p>-Section 5 (<b>Lines 262-281</b>) could be presented and expanded with more details in a tabular format with the following columns: Benefits (i.e., where the given rows will have environmental, economic, agronomic and social benefits considering the indirect benefits that could be derived), Description, Source/Literature.</p> <p><b>-Sections 6, 7 and 8:</b> There is no need for authors to create several sections with limited content. They could place all results and discussion under one section where these sections could be sub-sections instead of main sections with limited details. Therefore, authors are advised to re-organize or restructure this review study or synthesis report for coherence and consistency purposes:            Abstract, Introduction, Related works/literature review (optional) Methods, Results and Discussion, Conclusion.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

	<p><b>Conclusion:</b>          -The study could highlight some gaps/limitatons in this study briefly that could drive future studies.          -The main findings or standpoints in this study needs to be summarized clearly in the conclusion. What's given is not so appropriate.          -The study's importance or relevance to the international scientific community and other players could be highlighted briefly.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p><b>Other comments:</b>          -Major grammatical defects and syntax errors were identified in this study. Authors are advised to seek for someone with command over English to address proficiency issues in this manuscript.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is generally informative. However, there are several issues that need to be addressed as the current state of the manuscript is far from being ready for acceptance.</p>	

**PART 2:**

	<p><b>Reviewer's comment</b></p>	<p><b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i></p>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Isaac Sarfo
Department, University & Country	Nanjing University of Information Science and Technology, China