

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_127470
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative study of conservation and conventional practice on total productivity of wheat-mungbean-T. aman rice cropping pattern
Type of the Article	

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the 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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The work is perusing about the provide valuable insight into the country's conservation and conventional practice and wheat-mungbean-T. aman rice cropping pattern.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes it is correct but as per me needs some improvisation "Unveiling Productivity Dynamics: A Comparative Study of Conservation vs. Conventional Practices in Wheat-Mungbean-T. Aman Rice Cropping Systems"	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is correct	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The paper is very well written and the manuscript is well structured as per the journal requirement. Hence, can be accepted in your precious journal.  As per me, only title is to be reframed while other sections such as introduction (the results are very well introduced), research methodology (the recent methodologies are employed this work) and results connotes the existing literatures while the results are very well discussed.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are enough to quantify this research.	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes it can be scholarly communicated	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

#### PART 2:

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

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hari Shankar Singh
Department, University & Country	CSAUA & T, India