

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_109386</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Soil Management Practices to Enhance Carbon Sequestration Rates- A review</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Yes, it is important for the scientific community.</p> <p>Yes, the title is suitable.</p> <p>As per me, there must be one section of rate of carbon sequestration on different land use system or cropping pattern. In that, one should prove among them Agro-forestry sequestrate at par with other. Your abstract and conclusion is not in synchrony with the manuscript because you haven't proved agro-forestry is best.</p> <p>The sub-structure is written well however, there is need of correction under this manuscript which is as follows:</p> <p>1. The Authors are requested to please incorporate the hypothesis and major objective of study in the question form that why this review has been undertaken in your introduction section.</p> <p>2. Future Direction is not properly written and the author is talking about biochar which is not practically feasible. It is simply an alternative of aerobic burning of organic wastes.</p> <p>2. Revise the Abstract and Conclusion which should be based on the data and matter produced in the manuscript.</p> <p>3. The manuscript has major mistakes in reference section. As, much of the references don't have their issue number or much of them don't have the name of all authors (blue coloured).</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>This manuscript is very well written and does not have any language problem.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> 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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Shivam Singh</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel University of Agriculture and Technology, India</b>