

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_126847
Title of the Manuscript:	Enhancing the efficacy of National Action Plan on Climate Change through Traditional Ecological Knowledge based practices of Agricultural Waste Management: Qualitative Insights from India
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

[Review Form 3](#)

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript is significant for the scientific community because it reflects how TEK plays an important role in agricultural waste management in climate change and sustainability. It also presented valuable lessons that could be learned from indigenous agricultural practices regarding integrating the former into current agricultural policies, hence enhancing the efficacy of the NAPCC in India. I like the qualitative approach in the manuscript, as this will give nuanced experiences of farmers and shift the center towards community-driven solutions to environmental problems. Complementing this with a broader geographic scope may strengthen the generalizability and applicability of findings over diverse agricultural contexts.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The article titled, "Enhancing the efficacy of National Action Plan on Climate Change through Traditional Ecological Knowledge-based practices of Agricultural Waste Management: Qualitative Insights from India," is quite descriptive but may be a little too long and complex. Alternative Title: "Traditional Ecological Knowledge Applied to Agricultural Waste Management for Sustainability: Lessons to Inculcate into the Indian Climate Action Plan" In this alternative title, the focus has been on Traditional Ecological Knowledge, but in a rather concise and readable manner.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract is generally comprehensive to have stated the problem, methodology, findings, and implications, but a few suggestions go thus: Improvement Suggestion: Clarity and Conciseness: The abstract needs to be brief. Many complexly phrased sentences could have been streamlined to be more comprehensible. Key Findings: While this does state those traditional practices enhance resource optimization and sustainability, one or two important findings or examples must be highlighted to show what those practices are. Policy Implications: Policy implications would have to be spelled out more explicitly. Explaining how the findings as such can inform the NAPCC or call for specific policy action would further enhance the abstract. Research Gap: It could be useful to provide a statement on the particular lacuna in past research that this study covers, emphasizing the novelty of the work.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>It appears that the structure and subsections are appropriate for the content and stated objectives from the abstract to the introduction. The following observations are made with respect to its organization: Strengths: Logical Flow: This is logical flow from the introductory page through the materials and methods, results, discussion, and down to the conclusions. In this respect, it takes the reader through the rationale, methodology, findings, and implications of the study. Clear and separated sections, hence easy navigation across the sections. Where there are big headings, there is use of subheadings to break up bulk information. Thematic Organization: The results section is organized based on key themes; hence, coherent presentation of qualitative data. Recommendations for Improvement Subsection Titles Ensure that all subsections are titled. For instance, more specific titles of the result section can be made to depict the themes discussed, like "Traditional Practices Adopted" or "Combination of TEK and Modern Techniques." INTRODUCTION Depth: A particularly helpful end note or final summary of the composition of the manuscript may be useful. A general preview of what each section will include would help readers understand what they are to expect. Discussion Integration: Sometimes, results should integrate discussion points into them, which is particularly useful in a qualitative study. In that way, findings can be immediately contextualized without waiting for a separate discussion section. Conclusions Prioritization: The conclusion does not only have to summarize findings but also draw</p>	

Review Form 3

	out their implication for, and impact on, policy more clearly. Perhaps a separate subsection entitled "Implications for Policy" would strengthen that aspect.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript ensures scientific correctness and technical soundness through the rigorous qualitative methodology used for deep analysis in the case of Traditional Ecological Knowledge for agricultural waste management. In-depth interviews with farmers from different geographic areas add richness to the data, together with the validity of the credibility of the findings. Thematic analysis is quite appropriate for qualitative research providing subtleties on local practices and their implications for sustainability. Besides, the manuscript places its findings in a wide context of existing literature and frameworks of climate action; hence, making the research relevant and applicable in concrete real policy initiatives.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes. References are sufficient and recent	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality is adequate for scholarly communication, but revisions focusing on clarity, grammar, and consistency would significantly enhance the manuscript's quality and effectiveness in conveying its findings. A thorough review by a native English speaker or a professional editor may be beneficial.	
<u>Optional/General</u> 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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abrha Asefa
Department, University & Country	Adigrat University, Ethiopia