

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_130725
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance of rice-wheat cropping system under different production systems in irrigated subtropics of Jammu
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>

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 is important for the sustainable conservation of resources with retention of crop residues under alternative crop establishment techniques in the rice-wheat system themselves, which will improve the physicochemical parameters of the soil with greater performance of the system.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Performance of rice-wheat cropping system under conservation agriculture based different production systems in irrigated subtropics of Jammu	
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.	It would be important to include the experimental design used, the study variables, and the significant differences.  It is suggested to eliminate the geographical data of the study area.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	That's right	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Are correct	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	That's right	
Optional/General comments	<p>The article contains an interesting topic. However, some suggestions are sent both in this format and in the manuscript:</p> <p>The summary needs to include the experimental design used, the study variables, and whether there were significant differences. It is suggested to eliminate the geographical data of the study area.</p> <p>At the end of the introduction, the objective must be included, which must be clear and concrete.</p> <p>In <u>materials and methods</u>. It is suggested to incorporate soil information (type of soil, availability of N, P, K; pH, among others. It is suggested to incorporate information on the type of experimental design used, size of the plot (experimental unit), Name of the wheat and rice varieties; study variables; type of variance analysis, statistical program, Tukey tests or others.</p> <p>In <u>the results</u> section, it was observed that the tables and figures are not cited in the paragraphs either, they describe what they found in the study (which was the best treatment).</p> <p>In <u>the discussion</u> section. it is suggested to summarize.</p> <p>in <u>the conclusions</u> section. It is suggested that the conclusions be based on the results (which was the best treatment and in a concrete way.</p> <p>In the <u>references</u> section. There are no comments.</p> <p>In <u>the tables</u>, it is necessary to incorporate the footer of the table where it contains the information on the comparison of means, the probability. The <u>figure</u> lacks numerical information and also, if it is the comparison of means</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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Claudia Pérez Mendoza
Department, University & Country	INIFAP, México