



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCS_41228
Title of the Manuscript:	Modernized Review on Natural, Organic, Ayurvedic, and Homa Farming over Chemical Farming: Urgent Need of Sustainable Agricultural Practices
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>This paper is very interesting. However, most paragraphs written in a very lengthy manner and lack of continuous flow. Many irrelevant issues not related to the sub topic were discussed. Also, readers might find it difficult to understand certain terms that are not properly explained.</p> <p>Line 37: surely not only Line 43: Include the abbreviation (GR) in “the Green Revolution (GR) technology” Line 53: In table 1 – separate “wasps and” Figure 1: Elaborate more on Figure 1 Aspects of organic farming Figure 2: Explained more on the type of organic farming Figure 3: Can be divided into 4 figures and elaborate each figure. Line 110: What is FYM? Line 111: The terms <i>Panchgavya</i>, <i>Jeevamruta</i> and <i>Beejamruta</i> need to be written or explained in English for better understanding of the readers. Line 121: Define ‘Homa therapy’ Line 124: Define ‘Agnihotra’ Line 131 – 164: Is this paragraph necessary? What it has to do with organic farming or biopesticides for healthy future? Line 165 – 193: Too lengthy description on the method of analysis Line 194: Selection Line 194 – 256: Paragraphs did not mention about organic biopesticides for healthy future, instead more to biopesticides detection procedure Line 257 – 370: Too lengthy discussion on method for pesticides detection analysis Line 371 – 391: This paragraph is alright initially but still does not tell why we have to opt for natural biopesticides. Line 392: <i>Azadiracta indica</i> (use common format for writing species name. Check for others as well throughout the manuscript). Line 397: ..the adults of both sexes. Which species or pest? Line 405: <i>Damalinia bovis</i> (italics) Line 423: which key neem pesticidal components? Line 426 – 437: These paragraphs has nothing to do with neem as a biopesticides Line 492 – 520: With the exclusion on the part about lice, this paragraph can still be accepted after improvement. Line 524 & 525: NeemAzal is a neem based product? Line 546 – 579: Review more on the potential of neem cake as biopesticides against mosquitoes instead of protocol for determination Line 589 – 636: This paragraph is alright but flows of the contents are not written well. Line 655 – 666: Lack of introduction on celangulin, matrine. Readers are at loss. Line 703: What is ‘Jaivik Krishi’?</p>	<p>Thank you very much for reviewer's compliments about the manuscript. Yes I am agreeing with respected reviewer's comments. I have corrected all the unrelated terms and abbreviations. The titles of figures and tables are corrected according to your suggestions.</p> <p>Regards</p>
Minor REVISION comments	-none-	



SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	-none-	
----------------------------------	--------	--