

Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_123056
Title of the Manuscript:	Crop diversification with pulses for enhancing soil nutrient dynamics in conservation agriculture
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>

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.	It is important for the scientific community. Conservation agriculture is the urgent need for sustainable agriculture. This research review will be valuable for effective conservation agriculture through soil nutrient management.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes. It is appropriate to the study topic.	

<p>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.</p>	<p>Yes. It is appropriate for the research review.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes. Subsections are appropriate.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>It is following scientific style of writing for research review. Explanation of this review report is approaching. This review study will be reviving conservation agriculture practices.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Yes. The references are appropriate and update.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Not yet. Yes, The English language quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>This review article is recommended for acceptance.</p>	

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:	Gyan Prakash Morya
Department, University & Country	Vital Biotech Research & Training Institute, India