

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_130185
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Soil Physical Properties in Natural and Farmer Practices in the Northern Dry Zone of Karnataka
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: 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.	This is an important examining how conventional (modern) farming and natural (non-conventional farming) practices determine the organic soil properties. This work holds the potential to pave the way suggesting farmers opt for selective crops in varying soil and terrains.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	A slight change in the title is required, a title may be revised as: Evaluation of Soil Physical Properties in Natural and Conventional Farming Practices in the Northern Dry Zone of Karnataka	The title has been revised to reflect the suggested changes for better clarity and precision: "Evaluation of Soil Physical Properties in Natural and Conventional Farming Practices in the Northern Dry Zone of Karnataka." This aligns with the study's focus and ensures relevance to the topic.
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.	Abstract line no 6; examined may be written as examines and remove both from the sentence.	The word "examined" has been replaced with "examines," and "both" has been removed as suggested. The updated abstract reflects this revision for improved grammatical accuracy.
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, it is	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The introduction section lacks references, the author may add relevant references from the recent 5-10 years	Relevant references from the last 5–10 years have been added to strengthen the introduction section and provide updated context for the study.
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	The author may peruse and revise the following; <div><div>1.</div><div>Since the work is solely dedicated to soil properties. The paper lacks in the determination of soil texture because bulk density is related to soil texture in that finer-textured soils have lower bulk density, while coarser-textured soils have higher bulk density. Determination of soil texture would have augmented the manuscript into a more precise piece of work.</div></div> <div><div>2.</div><div>The manuscript lacks in discussion of the present work concerning its importance, relevance to farmers, and prospects.</div></div> <div><div>3.</div><div>The author may remove the table from the lateral part of the discussion section and arrange it in the result section.</div></div> <div><div>4.</div><div>The paper also failed to delineate the study area or the number of areas from where the sampling was done.</div></div> <div><div>5.</div><div>The study areas may be presented with the help of a map would enhance the paper.</div></div>	While soil texture determination was not part of the initial scope of this study, its importance in interpreting bulk density and other soil properties is acknowledged. This limitation has been discussed in the manuscript, and its implications have been highlighted in the revised discussion section. Study area map cited in material and method part.

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>	