

Review Form 1.7

JournalName:	InternationalJournalofPlant&SoilScience
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_IJPSS_114227
TitleoftheManuscript:	EnhancingSoilHealthandSustainability:TheImpactofMeliadubia-basedAgroforestryinaSemi-aridRegionofHaryana,India
TypeoftheArticle	

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write a 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) Yes, the manuscript is of significant importance to the scientific community, especially those focusing on agroforestry, soil science, and sustainable agriculture. It provides valuable insights into the benefits of integrating Melia dubia in agroforestry systems for soil health and sustainability in semi-arid regions. Previous studies, such as those by Shin et al. (2020) on ecosystem services in agroforestry and by Siqueira et al. (2020) on soil recovery through agroforestry systems, have laid the groundwork for understanding the multifaceted benefits of agroforestry. This study builds on that foundation by providing empirical data specific to Melia dubia's impact on soil properties, an area less explored in semi-arid contexts. Highlighting the potential of Melia dubia in enhancing soil health is valuable. However, emphasizing its broader implications for climate resilience and agricultural productivity could strengthen its importance further. (2) The title is suitable as it accurately reflects the study's focus on Melia dubia-based agroforestry and its benefits for soil health and sustainability. While the current title effectively communicates the study's focus, it could be enhanced for clarity and impact. Consider specifying the key benefit or outcome observed, such as "Enhancing Soil Health and Carbon Sequestration through Melia dubia Agroforestry in Semi-arid Haryana, India," to immediately convey the study's value proposition. (3) The abstract provides a concise overview of the study's objectives, methodology, key findings, and implications. It highlights the positive impact of Melia dubia-based agroforestry on soil properties, making it comprehensive. To enhance its comprehensiveness, it could benefit from briefly mentioning the study's limitations and potential areas for future research, providing a more rounded overview of the work. (4) The structure is logical and facilitates understanding. However, integrating a separate section on the implications of the findings for local farmers and policy-making could bridge the gap between research and application, emphasizing the practical significance of the study. (5) The manuscript appears scientifically sound, but ensuring the robustness of statistical analyses and the validity of conclusions could be further highlighted. Discussing any assumptions made during the research and how they might affect the outcomes would enhance the manuscript's scientific rigor. (6) The references include a mix of recent and foundational studies, covering a wider range of relevant topics. However, incorporating more recent studies, especially those published in the last 2-3 years, could provide a more up-to-date context. Additionally, discussing how this study fills gaps in the existing literature would highlight its contribution more effectively (although novelty is not required in this specific case) 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language is suitable.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is good overall, but some elements below can be further enhanced in a future version:</p> <p>The manuscript would benefit from a more detailed explanation of the statistical methods used to analyze the data. Including information on statistical software, the rationale for choosing specific tests, and how data normality was assessed would enhance the reliability of the results.</p> <p>While the study presents valuable data on soil improvements under <i>Melia dubia</i>, a comparative analysis with other agroforestry systems or tree species could offer a broader perspective on its relative effectiveness. Such comparisons could be discussed in the context of existing literature.</p> <p>Long-term Impact: The manuscript discusses the short-term effects of <i>Melia dubia</i>-based agroforestry on soil health. It would be beneficial to discuss or hypothesize the long-term sustainability of these benefits, considering soil fertility, biodiversity, and potential challenges such as pest management.</p>	
---	--	--

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Pedro Siciliano Peixoto</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Instituto Militar de Engenharia, Brazil, Stanford University, US</p>