

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | International Journal of Environment and Climate Change |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_IJECC_110975 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | THE STUDY OF DIFFERENT LAND USE SYSTEM ON THE CARBON STOCK AND C-FRACTIONS UNDER VARYING SOIL DEPTH IN CHANDEL DISTRICT OF MANIPUR |
| Type of the Article | Original Research Article |

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

| | 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> |
|---|--|---|
| <p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This manuscript is crucial for the scientific community as it precisely quantifies soil nutrient variations across different land use systems in the Chandel district of Manipur. Researchers and practitioners in soil science, agriculture, and environmental science will find the findings directly applicable to addressing local challenges. 2. Assessing Carbon Stock and C-Fractions in Response to Varied Land Use Systems and Soil Depths in Chandel District, Manipur 3. The abstract provides a comprehensive overview of the study, presenting the rationale, methodology, and key findings. However, there are areas where clarity and precision can be improved 4. Needs improvement 5. Yes 6. Its fine | |
| <p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | <p>Has poor language quality such that it cannot be understood by readers Difficult to follow logic or poorly presented data.</p> | |
| <p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The abstract could benefit from explicitly stating the specific objectives of the study. What precisely were the researchers aiming to understand or achieve? 2. Please clearly mention your experimental design and statistical approach 3. The abstract might be improved by including some quantitative data. 4. Please add a clear hypothesis at the end of your introduction 5. Also highlight the potential benefit of your research 6. Also mention how this study is different and novel by comparing with the previous literature. 7. Revise the objective of your research. | |

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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: | Sohail Ahmad |
| Department, University & Country | The University of Haripur, Pakistan |