

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_JABB_117894
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of zero tillage on soil properties, weed dynamics and performance of chickpea under rice – chickpea cropping system: A review
Type of the Article	Review 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://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<p>The manuscript is an elaborate review of zero tillage systems which is important for the scientific community to delve into the ZT practices for prospects</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, Minor changes are required to avoid repetition of the lines</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>There are changes desired which have been mentioned in the comments section</p> <p>References are sufficient however, recent references need to be added to the manuscript.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No, Grammatic mistakes are there, thus it should be thoroughly checked for corrections	
Optional/General comments	<p>The manuscript is a good piece of work, however it</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Has language issues- Has Grammatic mistakes- Has limited number of Recent References, most of the references are more than 20 years old- At certain places the sense of the sentence or paragraph is unclear	

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:	Komal Arora
Department, University & Country	DAV College Jalandhar, India