

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_105787
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of zero-budget natural farming on yield, earthworm populations, microbiological activity, and the requirement for public Policy: A Review
Type of the 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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/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>Yes, the manuscript is of an invaluable importance to the scientific community.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The abstract needs addition of important information missing from the main manuscript itself Although the contents of the manuscript are of great importance, it needs more organization in terms of structure and contents The manuscript is scientifically correct but it lacks important details such as clear aims and methodology section and well as precise conclusion</p> <p>yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Some grammatical errors are present but the overall manuscript is well understood	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Lack of Critical Analysis: While the article presents the benefits of ZBNF, it lacks critical analysis and a balanced perspective. It does not address potential limitations, challenges, or criticisms associated with ZBNF, which is essential for a comprehensive review. Some sections, such as "Opportunities to adopt ZBNF" and "Public policies need for zero-budget natural farming," lack depth and specific details. Providing more comprehensive information and examples would strengthen these sections.</p> <p>More comments on specific sentences are placed in the main manuscript.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yasameen Abbas Humadi
Department, University & Country	Al-Nahrain University, Iraq