

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Annual Research &amp; Review in Biology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_127381
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>FACTORS INFLUENCING FARMER ADOPTION IN PROBLEMATIC SOIL RECLAMATION PRACTICES: A COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW</b>
Type of the Article	Review Article

#### **PART 1: Review Comments**

<u>Compulsory</u> 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>
<b>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.</b>	The Research paper basically deals with the modern issues of soil reclamation methods. This paper has a relevance as Indian economy basically deals with agriculture and issues related to farmers which are of utmost importance in an agrarian nation. The fate of an agrarian economy mostly depends mostly on the peasants and the methods adopted for farming and soil reclamation. The present paper rightly points out the necessity for identifying the causes and problems related to soil reclamation.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	A Comprehensive appraisal of various factors associated with problematic soil reclamation: A General Overview	
<b>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.</b>	It is comprehensive. However a little spatio temporal analysis could have been better.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	If is inadequate. Much more sectional bifurcation is needed. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION subsections are being missed.	
<b>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.</b>	The manuscript would have been much more better and technically sound even if certain quantitative analysis or data interpretation have been added. Moreover A NPK analysis regarding soil reclamation could have been better.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	Yes. More or less it is of recent time.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	More or less it is suitable as the author have used lucid English language.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper could have been better if the findings could have been discussed empirically.	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

	<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)
<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>Kathakali Bandopadhyay</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Subarnarekha Mahavidyalaya, India</b>