

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_127136
Title of the Manuscript:	Soil organic carbon in three selected agroforestry system at temperate zone (2000-2800m) of North Western Himalaya, Uttarakhand, India
Type of the Article	Original Research article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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)
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.	The manuscript could be useful to the scientific community as relevant sources of information.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The manuscript reflects a suitable title.	
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.	The abstract of the article is comprehensive yet needs revision.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Subsections and structure need to be revised for clarity and in conformity with the journal format.	
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 is scientifically correct as it is done according to scientifically acceptable standards.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient and suggested some more references to add. And also suggested the follow the journal guidelines for arrangement of references.	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes, the English quality is suitable for scholarly communications.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Additional suggestion: Arrange the Key words alphabetically.	

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:	Shailendra Bhalawe
Department, University & Country	College of Agriculture Balaghat, Jawaharlal Nehru Agriculture University, India