

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_99810
Title of the Manuscript:	A sustainable vision towards Regenerative Organic agriculture to sustain climate change and combat global warming
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:

(<https://www.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Importance: They highlighted that the vermicomposting system emitted an average of 463 CO₂-e/m²/h. This is less than the landfill emissions of 3640 CO₂-e /m² /h. Vermicomposting released at least N₂O – 1.17 mg/m²/h compared to aerobic and anaerobic compost (1.48 and 1.59 mg/m²/h, respectively). They came out with the conclusion that earthworms can play a good role in greenhouse gas reduction and mitigation strategies in municipal solid waste disposal. Organic systems show a nearly 30% increase in soil carbon over 27 years.</p> <p>2. Title: Concise and attractive to a certain extent but preferred to be modified into “A vision toward Regenerative Organic agriculture to sustain climate change and combat global warming”.</p> <p>3. Abstract: Clear to a certain extent. Some abbreviations were listed in the abstract without listing their full names on the first appearance. Many modifications were recommended to enhance the readability and understanding.</p> <p>4. Structure of the manuscript:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Keywords: Not listed. Introduction: Clear to a certain extent. Some modifications were suggested to enhance readability and understanding. The aim: should be listed by the end of the introduction section. Body of the review: Novel, clear to a certain extent, informative, and contribute to knowledge. Some citations have to be declared to which side are these references; with or against the results mentioned by the authors. Many modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text. Conclusion: Too long and have to be more concise. Some modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text. Tables: Well-presented and organized. Figures: Well-presented and organized. Renumber the figures after adding the first image in consideration for the counting as suggested. <p>5. Scientific Soundness: The review highlighted and discussed an important issue using a good evidence and support.</p> <p>6. References: Sufficient as 51.5% (34 out of 66) of the listed references were published in the past five years.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>General view: The manuscript was expressed in moderate English and grammar. Professional copyediting and proofreading have to be carried out before resubmission to achieve publishing value.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Essam Samir Soliman
Department, University & Country	Suez Canal University, Egypt