

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Annual Research &amp; Review in Biology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_ARRB_120574</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Relevance Of Natural Farming in Present Scenario of Bihar</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://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The article is important for the scientific community and is written on a topical topic.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article corresponds to the content.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	A link in the abstract is not desirable. In the abstract, briefly indicate the purpose of the work, methods, results and conclusions.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Separate the conclusions as a section.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Specify the results of the survey of natural resources mentioned in the article.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. :	The article uses relatively new literature. Pysarenko, P., Samojlik, M., Galytska, M., Tsova, Y., & Mostoviak, I. (2023). Influence of Bacillus subtilis on soil microbiocenosis. Ecological Questions, 34(2), 1–12. DOI: 10.12775/EQ.2023.038 Moskalenko, A. M., Volkohon, V. V. Economic grounding for ecologically safe strategy of mineral fertilizers use. Actual Problems of Economics. 2015. Vol. 171, Is. 9. P. 286–293 Bulyhin, S., Tonkha, O. 2018. Biological evaluation of the rationality of soil usage in agriculture. – Agricultural Science and Practice, 5(1):23–29. DOI: 10.15407/agrisp5.01.023 Rieznik, S., Havva, D., Dehtiarov, V., & Pachev, I. (2023). Dynamics of the Number of Functional Groups of Microorganisms under Different Farming Systems. In Journal of Mountain Agriculture on the Balkans (Vol. 26, Issue 1, pp. 549–567). Rieznik, S., Havva, D., Chekar, O. 2021. Enzymatic activity of typical chernozems under the conditions of the organic farming systems. Scientific Papers. Series A. Agronomy, Vol. LXIV, Issue 2, P. 114-119. Rieznik, S., Havva, D., Butenko, A., Novosad, K. 2021. Biological activity of chernozems typical of different farming practices. Agraarteadus, 32(2) P. 307-313. DOI: 10.15159/jas.21.34. Dmytruk Y., Dent D. (eds) Soils Under Stress. Springer, Cham, 255 DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-68394-8 etc.	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments  Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Conduct a survey of farmers who took part in the activities in order to find out the usefulness and informativeness of your activities and the likelihood or willingness of them to switch to organic farming.	

### **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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Serhii Rieznik
Department, University & Country	State Biotechnological University, Ukraine