

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_118942
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of organic manures on productivity of groundnut- wheat cropping sequence under organic farming
Type of the Article	Original, Experimental

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://www.journalajsspn.com/index.php/AJSSPN/editorial-policy>)

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The findings are important and support the use of castor cake as an effective organic fertilizer to improve soil health and crop performance in crop rotation system. Comment on title of the article : Familiarity: "Crop rotation" is a more widely recognized term, even among non-specialists. Clarity: "System" or "rotation" might immediately communicate the concept more clearly to a broader audience. Suggestions: "Effect of Organic Manures on Productivity of Groundnut-Wheat Cropping Sequence under Organic Farming" or "Effect of Organic Manures on Productivity in a Groundnut-Wheat Sequence under Organic Farming" Abstatract : poorly written and errors in spelling- eg. consucutive – to change- consecutive. The line “effect of organic manures on productivity of groundnut-wheat cropping sequence under organic farming” – Should not copy paste title as objective lines rather you should paraphrased the objective to suit in abstract paragraph. Economics part should be included. Needs rewriting. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are not appropriately presented. <p>Introduction:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Errors in spelling and sentence structures. Weak English language and presentations. Need about the descriptions on soil nutrient condition about the experimental site from previous literatures. Needs to discussion about integrated nutrient management system in practices. need of economics of soil nutrition management and crop yields related paragraph. Lack of roles of legumes, groundnut itself as nitrogen sources in field crops nutrition. Economics part should be included in the introduction with its significance. The concluding line of introduction needs to rewrite emphasizing on organic supplement as nutrients in crop rotation crop in the experiment. <p>Materials and Methods</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Spelling mistakes, needs corrections. Poorly described methods. RDN and FYM – write in full form also. No mention about source and varietal description of wheat and groundnut and cake properly. Better to rewrite with appropriately addressing the issues. The tools of statistical analysis not described and statistical conclusion not made. <p>RESULTS and DISCUSSION</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The results and discussion is not constructed well with flow of language and a general trends of presenting results and discussions. The economics part is nice of the study as a whole but it was not given enough value here in the discussion section. The results are not well articulated and not discussed well and citation is poor. Presentations can be done better with graphical representations in some of the results than showing tables only. 	

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language/English quality of the article is minimal in standards and needs a support from a suitable scholar or professional writer from English communications. A guided supervised support from experienced scientist is needed to improve the writing and improvement of the article.	
Optional/General comments	A guided supervised support from experienced scientist is needed to improve the writing and improvement of the article.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bidur Prasad Chaulagain
Department, University & Country	Himalayan College of Agricultural Sciences and Technology (HICAST), Purbanchal University, Nepal