

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_112819</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of organic, inorganic and integrated production systems on crop productivity and soil fertility under north Gujarat condition.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>research article (quantitative method)</b>

## Review Form 1.7

### PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The manuscript holds significant importance for the scientific community by conducting a thorough investigation into the effects of various production systems on crop productivity and soil fertility in North Gujarat. The research, spanning from 2015-16 to 2021-22, provides valuable insights with quantifiable metrics, contributing to informed decision-making in agriculture.</li> <li>2. The title, "Effect of organic, inorganic and integrated production systems on crop productivity and soil fertility under north Gujarat condition," is suitable for the content of the manuscript.</li> <li>3. Yes, the abstract provides a comprehensive overview of the field experiment, including the studied factors (organic, inorganic, and integrated production systems), the experimental setup, and key findings related to crop productivity, soil fertility, and different treatments.</li> <li>4. The manuscript's subsections and overall structure seem appropriate, facilitating a clear presentation of the study's objectives, methods, results, and conclusions. However, a closer examination by the authors or peers may provide more nuanced insights into the organization and flow of information.</li> <li>5. The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct in presenting the results of the field experiment and discussing the effects of different production systems on crop productivity, soil fertility, and related parameters. However, a more detailed review by domain experts is advisable for a thorough assessment.</li> <li>6. The references in the manuscript appear to be sufficient and include a variety of sources. However, it's essential to ensure that the references are up-to-date and relevant to the study. The inclusion of recent literature could enhance the manuscript by providing additional context and supporting the discussion with the latest findings in the field. Authors may consider reviewing the literature to identify any pertinent references published in the last few years.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>	<p>The overall language and English quality of the article are acceptable for scholarly communication. However, there are some areas where the language can be improved for clarity and coherence. Consider revising certain sentences and phrases to enhance the flow of ideas and ensure that the intended meaning is conveyed effectively. Additionally, proofreading for grammatical and typographical errors would contribute to the overall professionalism of the manuscript.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

### 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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Adi Prabowo</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Indonesia</b>