

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_124572
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of conservation tillage in potato – A review
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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 is relevant for rice straw management, soil properties, and potato production and would be useful in other areas of potato cultivation. However, the author would refer to the more recent references. Please pay attention to the number that appears in the designated unit.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Conservation tillage's relevance in potato production: improving soil quality and growth performance	
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.	yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No, I didn't understand why the table was shown in the introduction section; it should have been placed in a different section.	
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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Some parts, such as the immobilisation of plant nutrients and their subsequent mineralisation, require a more detailed explanation. 2. "lessen the impact of negative environmental effects in agriculture and farming, such as soil deterioration and erosion, which resulted in lower production." Please clarify this sentence. 3. "more LAI (2.54 and 3.27)" What is LAI, what is its number, and what is a unit? 4. "whereas, in case of later the intensive tillage and proper pulverization of soil helped better root development and also increased the contents of macronutrients (N, P, K, Ca, and Mg) which helped in attaining more crop growth." Plase cealified the sentence. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Please provide more recent references.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Could you please use more precise English?	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 3

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:	Suphathida Aumtong
Department, University & Country	Maejo University, Thailand