Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Journal of Scientific Research and Reports**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JSRR_130758**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Influence of Tillage and Nutrient Management on Growth and Yield of Maize: 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

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 paper is a literature review without discussion and clear structure. Especially on the tillage parameter different references are cited with contradicting results without possibility to analyse, why the results are contradictory. But overall there is no significant trend regarding yield. This is not discussed in the paper, nor does the paper reflect a general understanding of the effect of tillage on soil health and other soil parameters.**	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	**Yes**	
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.	**Yes**	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	There are some mistakes or at least obvious contradictions to general knowledge, which are not reflected. To the extent possible they have been corrected in the manuscript in track change. Besides the extensive literature review, there is no discussion of the findings with some own thoughts of the authors and an interpretation of the findings. The conclusions are extremely short and partly mistaken. This should be amended with a chapter on discussion and some clearer conclusions.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	In general the references are ok; but on one of the main topics, Conservation Agriculture, there is a lack of international standard references to that topic, which also reflects in the understanding of soil degradation and health in the paper.	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	**Reviewer's comment** **Comments and corrections in the manuscript in track change. Some comments:** **Introduction:** **If this term refers to Conservation Agriculture as defined by FAO and not just to any type of conservation farming, it should be written with capital letters.** **As by definition, Conservation Agriculture is a no-till system with minimal soil disturbance, not minimal tillage. (pls. correct)** **Under south Asian climatic conditions, the loss of soil organic matter even under conservation tillage is still higher than the build up of SOM. (pls. correct)** **2.1:** **These hight differences do not seem to be significant, perhaps with exception of zero tillage without residues.There is plenty of evidence for this and I am sure, this is also what the cited reference expresses. Pls. rephrase.** **Permanent beds are not tilled.** **2.2;** **Li Hongwen and He Jin are the chinese Conservation Agriculture champions. However, the system was developed in China coming from the conservation tillage movement and this term is maintained since the government has adopted a support policy under the term conservation tillage. Yet, they mean Conservation Agriculture, when they write conservation tillage.** **Conclusion:** **This needs to be more specific: the results show no significant impact of tillage on yield, but tillage is known to destroy soil health. Therefore for a sustainable intensification the only acceptable tillage practice is no-tillage under Conservation Agriculture as system. This needs to be worked out better in the conclusion. Pls. Refer to respective references, for example by Kassam et al.**	

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:	**Theodor Friedrich**
Department, University & Country	**Germany**