

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_109263
Title of the Manuscript:	Crop residues management option in rice-wheat cropping system: A review
Type of the Article	

### PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?  4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?  5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?  6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.  (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<p>The manuscript is important for the scientific community. It discusses the advantages and disadvantages of crop residue management systems in India. The uses of crop left overs were emphasized while highlighting the disadvantages of burning these residues because it emits green house gases.</p> <p>The title of the article can be rephrased to read as : Crop Residue Management Options in rice - wheat cropping systems. A case study of the Indian experience. The Abstract is more like an introduction to the study. It did not really summarize the major experiences of crop residue management for rice and wheat. The structure of the manuscript is scattered, there are so many numbering in no particular order. It should be reaaranged. The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>The references are not sufficient for the review article. The entire work was centred on just a few Indain experiences. More work from other countries could also be reviewed.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Corrected</p> <p>Amended revision</p> <p>Ok</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<p>The English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	<p>Ok</p>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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)	