

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Original Manuscript_JABB_117894</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of zero tillage on soil properties, weed dynamics and performance of chickpea under rice – chickpea cropping system: A review</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

### **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**

	<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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Among the methods of tillage, zero tillage is one of the most studied for its effects on the soil structure, the economic aspect and is even advocated in other countries. The critical study of this tillage on the growth of chickpea in a crop association system is therefore interesting because it falls within the framework of reasoned production. This study which takes stock of knowledge is therefore useful for the scientific community.</li> <li>2. The title of this article is suitable.</li> <li>3. The abstract does not respect the classic elements of a scientific abstract (introductory sentence-objective-methodology-results-perspective). The introductory part is quite long, the objective and methodology are not included. On the "substantive" aspect, the impact of zero tillage on chickpeas is not addressed throughout the said abstract? The abstract simply focused on the impact of zero tillage on the soil and weeds and the benefits of such a practice on agricultural finances. What is the connotation of the chickpea-rice system in the abstract? The abstract lacks many elements to complete its understanding.</li> <li>4. The structure of manuscript is not appropriate. This manuscript is a review. This article is a review. It must present, in the methodology section, how and where the documents used were found (keywords, search engines, nature of the documents). It must present the inclusion and exclusion criteria which allowed the final choice of the documents collected. It must also emphasize how the information was summarized and presented (table, figure). Said document as presented and submitted cannot be reproduced without these methodological aspects.</li> <li>5. No because, for a scientific article, several shortcomings are highlighted. Furthermore, at the level of the presentation of the results and discussion, we do not distinguish between the documents which serve as a basis and those which will serve as support or comparisons of information. We suggest that for each type of result, figures or tables of research be presented and commented on. This summary of information related to one type of results is either supported or refuted by other research. The author's personal touch can synthesize or shed light on this type of result. In this way, we would better understand the explanations and results presented. In the conclusion section, we appreciate the synthesis effort and we suggest, after this critical review, the perspectives or areas of work identified for future research.</li> <li>6. More than 75% of the documents are more than 10 years old and 45% of them are more than 20 years old. The references are not recent and many of them need to be updated.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The English quality of the document is suitable for scientific communication.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Other specific comments were presented in the manuscript under review.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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>Nodiet Melody Dahou</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Abomey-Calavi, Benin</b>