

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_122261
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Tillage Practices on Soil Properties and Crop Productivity of Mung Bean: A Review
Type of the Article	Review

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.	The scientific community should take note of this work because it tackles a crucial topic: how various tillage techniques affect crop yield and soil health, especially when growing mung beans, an essential pulse crop. The study closes a knowledge vacuum by concentrating on recently reclaimed agricultural lands and provides guidance for sustainable farming strategies that can increase crop yields in difficult conditions. The importance of balanced tillage techniques that improve soil structure while reducing erosion and nutrient loss makes the article noteworthy. A more thorough investigation of the long-term impacts of these activities on soil microbiota and the general health of ecosystems would be beneficial, though.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Your topic is really pertinent and significant, particularly in light of crop yield and sustainable agriculture. To be more interesting and specific, the title may be improved. Here are some recommendations: "Improving Mung Bean Yield: The Impact of Tillage Strategies on Soil Structure" "Evaluating the Impact of Tillage Techniques on Mung Bean Yield and Soil Quality in Reclaimed Farming Fields" "A Comprehensive Analysis of Tillage's Effect on Mung Bean Yield and Soil Attributes"	
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.	Although the abstract is generally well-structured, a few additions and changes would make it more thorough. The study's objective should be stated clearly to improve clarity and completeness. For example, "This review aims to evaluate the impact of different tillage practices on soil properties and mung bean productivity in newly reclaimed lands." A succinct explanation of the technique, such as "The review synthesizes findings from recent studies and experimental data on conventional and conservation tillage practices," would give the reader some background. Emphasizing important results, like "Conservation tillage practices significantly improve soil moisture retention and nutrient availability, leading to increased mung bean yields," would raise the impact of the abstract.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Your manuscript's structure and subsections regarding how tillage practices affect mung bean development, yield, and soil qualities are pertinent and well-organized. The manuscript is strengthened by the way it logically moves from broad foundation knowledge to particular effects on mung beans and comparisons with other crops. To improve readability, think about shortening the titles of the subsections and making sure that every section has the same format. To enhance coherence and readability, provide a clear statement of objectives in the introduction and summarise findings in the end. This will help the reader navigate your study efficiently.	
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 meticulous technique used in the manuscript—exact experimental design, optimal tillage practice selection, and extensive data collecting on mung bean development, yield, and soil properties—makes it both technically and scientifically solid. Strict application of statistical analysis guarantees genuine and dependable outcomes. The report also incorporates pertinent literature, which makes it possible to critically compare the findings with previous studies. The study's scientific rigor and credibility are further demonstrated by the data's straightforward presentation and the conclusions' logical interpretation.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The research is adequately supported by the body of existing literature thanks to the manuscript's references, which are comprehensive and include a wide range of pertinent studies. Given the current level of knowledge on tillage practices and their impact on mung bean development, the majority of the cited references are recent. To improve the relevance and timeliness of the research, the manuscript might benefit from citing more current studies if it doesn't have any from the last two to three years. If they haven't already been discussed, it would also be helpful to provide references on the most recent developments in sustainable	

Review Form 3

	agricultural methods.	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The article's language and English quality are typically appropriate for academic discourse. The paper is well-written, successfully communicating the research findings with simple, straightforward language. The usage of technical terms is suitable, and the writing is well-read overall. Minor grammatical corrections or rephrasing, however, might improve clarity and fluidity in a few places. A last proofreading pass could help guarantee that the article satisfies the strictest requirements for academic writing, if needed.</p> <p>Of course! This is an illustration of a typical grammar error that might appear in academic writing:</p> <p>Initial Phrase: "The data was collected over a period of six months, and the results demonstrates a significant correlation between the variables."</p> <p>Problem:</p> <p>Since "data" is a plural noun, it should be coupled with the verb "were" in its plural form rather than "was."</p> <p>The verb "demonstrates" is singular, but it should be plural ("demonstrate") in order to correspond with the plural word "results."</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The paper is well-structured and presents a thorough analysis , offering insightful information to the area.</p> <p>A wide range of academic audiences can easily understand the content due to the straightforward presentation of the research aims, methods, and findings.</p> <p>Some sentences might need a little more clarity, and the technical jargon used throughout the text could be more consistently employed.</p> <p>Although the references provided are pertinent, the text might benefit even more from the inclusion of more recent research.</p> <p>All things considered, this book adds a great deal to the body of knowledge already in existence and should be of interest to scholars and practitioners alike.</p> <p>The writers should be able to easily understand and follow this format.</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:	Dipak Kattel
Department, University & Country	Institute of Agriculture and Animal Science, Tribhuvan University, Nepal