

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRB_120653
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of long term tillage and soil moisture regime on the sulphur, organic carbon, DOC, MBC and MBN of soil under mung bean-wheat and sorghum-wheat cropping system
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	Author's Feedback (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.	<b>Important to the scientific community</b> , as this study how the impact of long-term tillage and soil moisture regime during the cultivation process. It supports the study of nutrient status such as S, C etc. in soil and crop systems. Thus, the results of this study can be used as a form of indicator during the agricultural cultivation process.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<b>The title of the article is correct</b>	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	<b>The abstract is comprehensive</b> , However, it needs improvement in terms of describing the background (it doesn't need to be too long, it can be a maximum of 2 sentences).	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<b>Subsections and script structure are appropriate</b>	
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.	<b>The manuscript is scientifically strong and technically sound</b> , as it is structurally complete. However, it needs some improvement in accordance with the suggestions given.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. =	<b>The references provided are inadequate and not up-to-date and few</b> . Therefore, I suggest updating the last 5 years and also improving the data interpretation and discussion of the research data.	
Minor REVISION comments  Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<b>The English quality of the article is suitable for scientific communication</b> , but it is recommended that it be proofread by a language institute	
Optional/General comments	<b>The manuscript is very good, but needs to be improved according to the suggestions that have been given.</b>	

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 2:**

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

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Amsar Maulana</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universitas Andalas, Indonesia</b>