

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_122758
Title of the Manuscript:	Understanding Constraints in Zero Budget Natural Farming: A Comparative Study in Northern Karnataka
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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 to understand the constraints occurred in the current era while reverting to Natural Farming. The topic is an important one as highlights the obstacles in carrying out sustainable farming practices and use of organic manures. It might be of benefit to readers in understanding the ground situation of the farmers engaged in ZBNF.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the Topic is suitable	
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 appropriate	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes they are appropriate	
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 is well written. However, the authors could also mention about the demographic profile of the farmers and addition of comparative bars or columns in the results, which will help the readers to understand better.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Some references are quite old but it is understandable as they are merely the methods or techniques such as Garrett & Woodworth (1969). However, the other references used for data and incisive discussion like Mishra (2008); LVC (2010) can be replaced by newly published articles	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language used in the article has been decent and formal and well accepted for scholarly communication.	
Optional/General comments		

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>	

[Review Form 3](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anadi Ranjan Saikia
Department, University & Country	Assam Agricultural University, India