

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_128492
Title of the Manuscript:	Enhancing Sustainability, Profitability, and Energy Efficiency through Input Interventions in Existing Farming System in Southern Plain Zone of Rajasthan, India
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The study would enhance technological interventions which will further boost the sustainability, profitability, and energy efficiency of small and marginal farmers.	I thankful to you sir.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, suitable.	I thankful to you sir.
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 totally deviated from the norms of writing an acceptable abstract. You need to talk to: (i) Previous work that seems inadequate to warrant a further research. (ii) The specific problem the study is out to solve (iii) How to solve it – scope, methodology, data collection, theoretical approach, your findings and concluding end note.	I accept my mistake and I fully acknowledge the comments. I had done all suggest correction in in abstract part.
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes	I thankful.....
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Poor referencing style.	I added some more references.

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Qualitative	I thankful.....
Optional/General comments	<p>General guidelines for the Peer Review process:</p> <p>(1) Rework the abstract in order to give us a clear picture of what the entire work entails.</p> <p>(2) The introduction is weak. Hence makes the foundation of the study inadequate.</p> <p>(3) Problem of the study/research not clearly stated.</p> <p>(4) Scope of data collection should either be primary or secondary.</p> <p>(5) Theoretical framework?</p> <p>i. Name the propounder of the theory and in what year?</p> <p>ii. The principles of the theory and its applicability to your work.</p> <p>(6). Analysis should be preceded with Findings, summary, conclusion and recommendations with end note statement.</p> <p>(7). Poor referencing.</p>	I acknowledge all suggestions.

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)	