

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_113689
Title of the Manuscript:	The Revolutionary Impact of Regenerative Agriculture on Ecosystem Restoration and Land Vitality- A review
Type of the Article	Review 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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1) Yes, I appreciate the compilation of research and studies demonstrating the importance of regenerative agriculture. Recognizing the enormity of this subject, I believe this article provides a well-connected starting point for the scientific community to base their understanding of regenerative ag on. It is also written in such a way to be accessible to the layperson and policy makers.</p> <p>2) I love the title – it is accurate scientifically but also eye-catching for those unfamiliar with the subject, potentially increasing readership and interest.</p> <p>3) I found the abstract comprehensive, though the first sentence was mildly difficult to understand grammatically.</p> <p>4) The structure was useful in dividing a complex subject into manageable pieces. Though at times this felt redundant, it seems necessary to further emphasize the points of the article.</p> <p>5) I found the article to accurately reflect my understanding of and experience in the field of regenerative agriculture. I did, however, see one line that I find counter intuitive to the goal of the article: V1 states, “traditional breeding techniques or genetic modification”. My work with regenerative ag has always emphasized a departure from genetic modification. I feel that including such a phrase opens the doors to conventional practices being promoted as regenerative, using that expansive suggestion as reasoning.</p> <p>6) I found the references significant and interesting, and was pleased to the amount of research that went into this piece.</p> <p>7) I found the research on incorporating specific technologies into regenerative agriculture fascinating – my reference farms are all incredibly small scale, but I think I learned something about the balance struck when attempting to scale certain practices while respecting the needs of the ecosystem and farmer. One thing I wish was more incorporated was the positive impact of regenerative agriculture on social standing and systems. Such practices have a long-term positive impact on economic standing, gender equality and a reduction in crime and violence. Though the abstract suggested this would be a key piece of the study, I found the actual information on such things in the report to be somewhat limited. If one goal of this piece is to sway legislative bias, perhaps emphasizing the positive social changes could help. I was pleased to see the statistics on carbon sequestration and encourage a continuation of this research, especially as it pertains to, again, legislative sway.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, this was well written in English, though the very first sentence of the abstract was one I struggled with understanding grammatically. Perhaps it simply needs to be broken up.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I appreciate the opportunity to review this piece and was pleased to learn of the work being done in this field.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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> I found no ethical issues.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kia-Beth Bennett
Department, University & Country	St Lawrence University, United States