

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_118869
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT THE IMPACT OF PREPARATORY TILLAGE SYSTEMS ON SOIL PHYSICAL PROPERTIES AND SOYBEAN PRODUCTIVITY ON VERTISOL OF CENTRAL INDIA
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The problem with choosing a technological solution for tillage, including and for no-tillage is an essential point for their economic expediency when growing different crops under different regional conditions. In this sense, this experiment was designed to evaluate the effect of various preparatory tillage systems on soil physical properties and soybean productivity thereby finding a suitable tillage combination for Vertisol of the Vidarbha region of central India.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>I believe that the quality of the manuscript will improve if the authors consider the following recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The methodology includes 8 technological options (T1...T8), in the text they are replaced by their abbreviations, and in the conclusions the composition of the machines in the recommended options is indicated. It would be correct to adopt the same designation for the entire article. In the conclusions, it makes sense to leave them like that, but in brackets it is good to indicate (T?) or (ZT.....?) 2. It is not clear the authors' idea at the end of the presentation to indicate literary sources with contradictory conclusions about the influence of tillage on yield, but the soil type on which the experiments were conducted and the regional conditions of the cited studies are not indicated. 3. I would recommend using units derived from the international system rather than regional - "Mha" instead of "lakh". 4. I consider it superfluous to indicate the units of measurement in the intermediate titles. 5. Units of measurement are redundantly duplicated in the titles and in the tables/figures - they are marked in yellow. 6. I did not notice the marked references cited in the manuscript. 7. It is necessary to check the references from «Khedkar» - there is probably a mistake because there is no way from the same authors in the same journal with the same title in two different places in the journal!, also the spelling of the author «Özpinar» - "Ozpinar", and of "Moraes" in the text and references, authors marked in yellow in the references are not cited in the text. <p>Please see the manuscript</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>I can't comment on the quality of the English language</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	G. D. Kostadinov
Department, University & Country	Agricultural Academy, Sofia, Bulgaria