

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_130176
Title of the Manuscript:	Residue Retention in a Maize-Chickpea Cropping System under Conservation Agriculture Influence Soil biochemical attributes in Vertisol of Central India
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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.	The manuscript is indeed relevant to the scientific community but still needs to undergo some major revision for its acceptance and publication to the wider scientific audience. The manuscript contains a lot of scientific inconsistencies and grammatical discontinuities that need to be addressed by the author(s) to be sent for another review.	The concerns have been taken care
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title requires some modifications as per the suggestions I have made.	The title has been revised as per suggestion
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 of the article is not comprehensive. In summary, it lacks the brief background of topic, aim of study, analytical methods and recommendation.	As per reviewer comments the concern has been addressed
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript contains a lot of scientific inconsistencies that need to be addressed.	It has been taken care off in review
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are somehow recent and sufficient for this study except that some review on soil sampling and analysis should be included.	As per methodology which was followed so some references seems old

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality of the article is fairly good but still requires some thorough English editing.	Tried my best for English editing
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ The author(s) need(s) to improve of the entire manuscript, particularly its subsections focussing on abstract, materials and methods, results and discussion, while at the same time justifying the statistical test they conducted to ascertain the significance of the results. The author(s) did not discuss the results properly and therefore the discussion lacks some basic concepts and principles of the subject matter.○ The results presented for this study is very scanty and does not qualify the work as a full-length paper. However, if it fits the journal to accept it for publication, then I am suggesting that it should be accepted as a “Short Communication”.○ This is an agronomic experiment and therefore the author(s) need(s) to give a detailed agronomic background of the study area albeit the full literature review, which can strengthen the quality of the article.○ The discussion is not proper. The Journal needs to make sure that the findings are properly discussed and referenced to previous studies.○ The analysis and presentation are not of the quality to be considered for publication in a peer reviewed journal. I include multiple issues and recommendations for the authors to improve the work and manuscript, the totality of which will take some time to complete.○ The references are not properly done in the reference section as per journal style of referencing.○ It appears that the manuscript must undergo serious major revision before it can be considered for publication.○ I also think that the author(s) require some kind of academic mentoring/coaching to improve their level of applicability of scientific concepts and theories to identifying research gaps.	<p>Results have been presented in detail as per reviewer</p> <p>I request you to consider it as full-length paper as its now revised</p> <p>Agronomic parameters have been included</p> <p>References are arranged as per APA format</p>

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	