

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_106361</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>MGNREGA-Assisted Afforestation for Climate Moderation in India: An Overview</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

**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><b><u>Compulsory REVISION</u></b> comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p><b>Title:</b> The title is appropriate.</p> <p><b>Abstract:</b></p> <p><b>-Lines 12-13:</b> The highlighted sentence is ambiguous or grammatically incorrect. Please rephrase the said line for clarity.</p> <p>-I suggest authors reducing the wording in the abstract to less than 250 words. Again, this concluding line can be removed and replaced by the relevance or contribution of study findings.</p> <p><b>Introduction:</b></p> <p>-Though the rationale is quite clear, it is still unclear what the research progress is in the introduction and literature review aspect. What is known (i.e., other works done) about the said programme and what is unknown about the said programme that is important to be studied or driving the current study objectives.</p> <p>-For studies of this nature, it is important to liaise the concepts of the study to some standardized sustainability, economic and ecological-based theories. What theories currently anchor this study?</p> <p>-Though it is a review study or synthesis report, it is important for authors to highlight clearly what the specific objectives are in the introduction, as well as the contribution of study findings.</p> <p>-It will be appropriate for authors to design a conceptual map which visualizes the entire analysis or flow of the study in the methodology section.</p> <p>-Authors can refer to this recent study by <b>Sarfo et al. (2022)</b> and other similar literature to see their discussions on Forest Transition Theory, land use and sustainable development to enrich the literature aspect.</p> <p><b>-Sarfo, I., Shuoben, B., Beibei, L. et al. (2022). Spatiotemporal development of land use systems, influences and climate variability in Southwestern Ghana (1970–2020). <i>Environ Dev Sustain</i> 24, 9851–9883 (2022). <a href="https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-021-01848-5">https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-021-01848-5</a></b></p> <p><b>-Lines 121-149:</b> Please cite appropriately where necessary in the main text. Authors should not make readers assume these ideas were originally birth my them.</p> <p>-Kindly remove the table's title or caption from within and place above it. Kindly ensure uniformity or do same for other tables in the manuscript.</p> <p><b>Methodology:</b></p> <p>A section for methodology must be included.</p> <p>-Authors are advised to restructure or revise the study to culminate a methodology section. Though it is a review study, it is important to briefly describe the study area, highlight the research strategies or design and analysis procedures. State clearly the data used for evaluation or analysis; were documents used subjected to content analysis?</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

	<p>-Where did others obtain or acquire data from? It is still unclear in this study. Authors need to fill these gaps.</p> <p>-What is the workflow or mode of evaluation or analysis for this study?</p> <p><b>NB:</b> Authors need to look for representative works or check the format for review articles and structure the article to that accordingly as it is still unclear what the methodology, results and discussion are.</p> <p><b>Conclusion:</b></p> <p>-The conclusion here is too shallow and needs to be revised to briefly capture the main aim of the study, what the key findings are, recommendations, challenges or limitations/gaps/opportunities identified through this study that could drive future studies, as well as the significance of findings to industrial players and the international research community.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p><b>Other comments:</b></p> <p>-Major grammatical defects and syntax errors were identified throughout the study which few were corrected. I humbly advise authors to check and correct proficiency errors thoroughly before submitting the revised version.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is generally informative and has some level of application value. However, there are some critical concerns that border organization, language or flow and expounding of some key sections to improve the overall outlook or robustness of the study before the paper can be accepted or considered for publication.</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:	Isaac Sarfo
Department, University & Country	College of Geography and Environmental Science, Henan University, China