

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_127384
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF TILLAGE AND NUTRIENT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES ON GROWTH, DEVELOPMENT AND NUTRIENT CONTENT OF SOYBEAN (<i>Glycine max L.</i>) IN THE NORTH WESTERN HIMALAYAS
Type of the 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.	The article has nicely shown the importance of organic farming, INM, Zero tillage etc in terms of long term benefits for pea cultivation. The long term benefits of organic nutrients sources, zero tillage, residue management etc. on soil health is highlighted. Systematic adoption of such practices by the farmers may be helpful in sustaining the yield as well as maintaining soil health in the long run.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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?	Yes	
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 design of the experiment is robust. Statistical design and method of analysis were correct. The findings were depicted nicely in properly designed tables and explained nicely with sufficient references for justification. The number of sections used to present the findings were just and sound.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	The article may be considered for publication subject to incorporation of the correction/modifications suggested in the body of the manuscript.	

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:	Mrinal Choudhury
Department, University & Country	Assam Agricultural University, India