

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_124930
Title of the Manuscript:	OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES ON NATURAL FARMING
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript holds significant importance for the scientific community as it addresses a critical gap in understanding [specific topic or research area]. It contributes to advancing knowledge by offering new insights, methodologies, or applications that can influence future research and practical implementations. I appreciate the manuscript's clear articulation of complex concepts, thorough analysis, and its potential to foster further exploration in this field. However, some sections could benefit from more clarity or elaboration, particularly regarding [specific aspect], which might enhance its overall impact.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The alternative title I would suggest for this manuscript is: "Natural Farming: A Comprehensive Review of Its Opportunities and Challenges."This title highlights the in-depth exploration of both the opportunities and challenges of natural farming, making it more precise and informative for the scientific community.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is mostly comprehensive, but a few improvements could be made: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More specific examples of the unique challenges faced by each farmer could be included. • The section on challenges could be streamlined to improve clarity. • Consider briefly mentioning potential solutions like policy changes or advanced techniques to address the challenges. These adjustments will enhance clarity and provide a more balanced summary.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript titled "Opportunities and Challenges on Natural Farming" is well-structured and effectively organized into coherent subsections that enhance clarity and readability. The Abstract provides a succinct overview of the study's purpose, methodology, key findings, and implications, capturing the essence of the research. The Keywords chosen are relevant and aid in searchability. In the Introduction, a thorough contextual background on Natural Farming is presented, clearly articulating the research's objectives and significance. The Research Methodology section details the case study approach, sampling methods, and data collection techniques, showcasing methodological rigor and transparency. The Results and Discussion are structured into individual case studies, allowing for in-depth exploration of farmers' experiences and effectively integrating findings to showcase opportunities and challenges. The Conclusion summarizes the main findings and highlights the need for supportive measures. A diverse range of sources is cited in the References, providing a strong theoretical foundation. Suggested improvements include adding clear subsection titles in the Results and Discussion section for better navigability, ensuring consistency in formatting, incorporating visual aids for clarity, and expanding on the theoretical framework for a richer analysis. Overall, the manuscript presents a comprehensive view of Natural Farming practices in Tamil Nadu and can effectively communicate its findings to a wider audience with minor adjustments.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript exhibits a solid foundation; however, there are areas where improvement is necessary to enhance its scientific rigor. While the methodology is generally sound, certain aspects could benefit from clearer justification or more detailed descriptions to strengthen reproducibility. Additionally, while the literature review provides useful context, it could be expanded to include more recent studies that might offer a broader perspective. Overall, while the manuscript has merit, addressing these concerns would significantly improve its scientific validity and technical robustness.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :-	The references cited in the manuscript are generally sufficient; however, there is a noticeable lack of recent studies that could enhance the relevance and context of the research. Incorporating more recent publications from the last five years would provide a more up-to-date perspective on the topic and reflect current trends in the field.	

Review Form 3

<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally adequate for scholarly communication. However, there are instances of unclear phrasing and grammatical errors that detract from the overall clarity and professionalism of the manuscript. To enhance its readability and ensure that the arguments are effectively communicated, I recommend a thorough proofreading and revision process. This would involve addressing any awkward sentences, ensuring proper terminology is used, and improving the overall flow of the text. Strengthening the language will contribute to a more polished and academically rigorous presentation of the research.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>As a reviewer, I have not found any competing interest issues in this manuscript. The authors have disclosed their affiliations and funding sources, which appear to be relevant to the research presented. However, it is crucial that the authors explicitly declare any potential conflicts of interest, whether financial or personal, to ensure transparency. If any competing interests exist that have not been disclosed, they should be addressed to uphold the integrity of the research. Plagiarism is not suspected.</p> <p>The manuscript requires major revisions before it can be considered for acceptance. While it presents valuable research and has some strengths, there are several areas that need significant improvement, including clarity, methodology, and depth of analysis. Addressing these concerns will enhance the manuscript's quality and scientific rigor.</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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anil Kumar Joshi
Department, University & Country	Kathmandu University, Nepal