

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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<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>This manuscript holds substantial value for the scientific community as it addresses the role of Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK) in enhancing agricultural waste management, which is crucial for promoting climate resilience and sustainability. By integrating TEK into India's National Action Plan on Climate Change (NAPCC), it highlights a practical, community-based approach to resource conservation that aligns with broader environmental goals. I appreciate this manuscript's emphasis on culturally rooted practices, as it provides a unique perspective on blending traditional and modern waste management strategies to optimize resources and support ecological balance. This approach is not only scientifically innovative but also socially empowering, offering a pathway for marginalized communities to engage actively in climate action.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes</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>Yes</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript demonstrates scientific correctness and robustness through its rigorous methodology and detailed data analysis. It employs qualitative methods such as in-depth interviews and thematic analysis, which are appropriate for exploring traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) and agricultural waste management practices in a culturally specific context. The study's use of purposive random sampling and theoretical saturation enhances data reliability, while the inclusion of multiple geographic locations strengthens the generalizability of the findings. Additionally, the manuscript aligns its conclusions with existing policies and literature on climate resilience and sustainability, lending further credibility to its recommendations for integrating TEK into the National Action Plan on Climate Change (NAPCC).</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, but follow track changes in the manuscript file</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Check the document once for the minor changes and comments</p>	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tej Kumar Nepal
Department, University & Country	Bhutan