

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The comparative study of different tillage practices under rice-based cropping systems is very relevant and establishing the importance of conservation tillage with evidence regarding the increased productivity and soil health is highly appreciated.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes but if the word TILLAGE is added, the title would be more clear and justifiable Comparitive study of conservation and conventional tillage practices on total productivity of wheat-mungbean-T. aman rice cropping pattern	
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.	Yes, very well-structured abstract	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, the manuscript is scientifically sound	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Good	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The research paper is well documented and presented. Graphical representation wherever possible could improve its overall appearance instead of only tables. Minor grammatical mistakes can be corrected with a thorough reading of the manuscript. Added few comments in the manuscript with some suggestions.	

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:	Pittala Manoj Kumar
Department, University & Country	Kerala Agricultural University, India