Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Journal of Scientific Research and Reports**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JSRR_129362**
Title of the Manuscript:	**The Future of Farming: Addressing the Problems and Unlocking the Prospects of Conservation Agriculture- 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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is of significant importance to the scientific community as it provides a comprehensive review of conservation agriculture (CA), a critical approach for sustainable farming practices in the face of climate change, depleting natural resources and a growing global population. It highlights the principles, historical evolution and practices of CA, along with its potential to enhance soil health, increase crop productivity,and mitigate greenhouse gas emissions. By addressing the challenges and opportunities associated with CA, the manuscript serves as a valuable resource for researchers, policymakers,and practitioners working to promote sustainable agricultural systems. Its focus on the adoption of CA in diverse agro-ecological zones makes it a crucial reference for tailoring CA practices to regional needs and advancing global food security while preserving the environment.	
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	The title, **"The Future of Farming: Addressing the Problems and Unlocking the Prospects of Conservation Agriculture - A Review"**, is clear and descriptive, emphasizing both the challenges and opportunities of conservation agriculture (CA). It could be refined for greater precision and alignment with the article's focus. Suggested Alternative Title: **"Conservation Agriculture: Challenges, Opportunities and Pathways to Sustainable Farming"** This revised title maintains a balanced focus on the critical aspects of CA while being concise and directly appealing to readers interested in sustainable agriculture.	
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 comprehensive but could be improved by specifying the benefits of conservation agriculture (CA), such as enhanced soil health, water conservation and greenhouse gas mitigation, alongside its challenges, including economic barriers for smallholders, limited access to CA technologies and labor shortages. It could emphasize the need for targeted research to address knowledge gaps, such as the application of CA in diverse cropping systems and climates and briefly highlight policy implications, such as providing incentives for adoption. Redundancies could be minimized to create space for these points, making the abstract more impactful and focused. Including these elements would ensure a balanced presentation of the manuscript's scope, challenges and significance to the scientific community.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript appears to be scientifically accurate, supported by credible references from organizations like FAO and CIMMYT and peer-reviewed studies. It effectively discusses the principles, practices and advancements in conservation agriculture (CA), highlighting both its benefits and challenges. The references cited lend credibility to the claims and the examples provided, such as those from the Indo-Gangetic Plain, are relevant and well-contextualized. To ensure full scientific correctness, it is essential to verify that all cited references align with the claims, quantitative data are accurately represented and terminology is consistently used. Overall, the manuscript presents a scientifically sound discussion of CA, subject to validation of references and localized applicability.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references in the manuscript are diverse and cover a wide range of topics related to conservation agriculture (CA), including historical perspectives, practices and environmental implications. They include reputable sources like FAO, CIMMYT and well-known researchers in the field. Some references are relatively dated, with several from the early 2000s or earlier, which may not reflect the most recent advancements in CA technologies, practices, or challenges. **Suggestions for Additional References:** 1. **Recent Research on Climate-Smart Agriculture**: Studies published in the past 5 years focusing on CA's role in climate resilience, particularly in regions experiencing significant agricultural stress due to climate change. Example: Papers from journals like *Agricultural Systems* or *Sustainability*. 2. **Technological Innovations in CA**: Recent advancements in precision agriculture, no-till machinery and remote sensing technologies could be included to reflect current trends. Example: Studies exploring the use of AI and IoT in CA from *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture*. 3. **Regional Case Studies**: More recent and localized studies, especially from Asia and Africa, could provide updated insights into CA adoption, challenges, and outcomes. Example: Research published by organizations like ICRISAT or IRRI. 4. **Meta-analyses or Reviews**: Comprehensive reviews or meta-analyses published in the past 5 years that consolidate global findings on CA's efficacy in terms of crop yield, soil health and greenhouse gas mitigation.	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication, as it is clear, well-structured and conveys the key points effectively. The manuscript uses appropriate technical terms and maintains an academic tone throughout, making it accessible to researchers and practitioners in the field. **Areas for Improvement:** 1. **Repetition**: Some phrases and ideas are repeated, such as the general benefits and challenges of conservation agriculture, which could be streamlined for conciseness. 2. **Sentence Structure**: A few sentences are lengthy or complex, which may reduce readability. Breaking them into shorter, more precise sentences would improve clarity. 3. **Grammar and Word Choice**: While the grammar is largely accurate, some word choices could be refined to improve precision. For example, replacing vague terms like "numerous issues" with more specific descriptors would enhance the narrative. 4. **Flow and Transitions**: Some sections could benefit from smoother transitions between ideas to ensure a logical progression of arguments. 5. **Abstract**: The abstract, while comprehensive, could be revised for a more focused and succinct summary of the manuscript.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is well-structured and informative, providing a comprehensive overview of conservation agriculture (CA), including its principles, practices and benefits, making it a valuable resource for researchers and practitioners. It offers a balanced discussion by addressing both the opportunities and challenges associated with CA adoption. There is scope for improvement, such as incorporating more recent references to reflect advancements in the field, streamlining repetitive sections for better readability and including specific examples or case studies to enhance the practical relevance. The conclusion is engaging and emphasizes the potential of CA to address global sustainability challenges, but it could be further strengthened by elaborating on future research directions or policy recommendations. With minor revisions, the manuscript has the potential to make a significant contribution to the field of sustainable agriculture.	

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?	***(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)***	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Pooja S Beleri**
Department, University & Country	**University of Agricultural Sciences Bangalore, India**