

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_124874
Title of the Manuscript:	Restoration of degraded land using "VEAZCOMUTECH": case of Maroua I Municipality, Far North Region of Cameroon
Type of the Article	

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>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.</b>	This manuscript is valuable as it tackles the pressing problem of land degradation, which greatly affects agricultural sustainability, food security, and environmental resilience, particularly in vulnerable areas such as the Sahelian region of Cameroon. By introducing innovative methods like "VEAZCOMUTECH" for soil restoration, which integrates organic waste with sustainable agricultural practices, the manuscript presents a replicable and cost-efficient approach to rehabilitating degraded lands. It has the potential to make a significant contribution to the scientific dialogue on land restoration and climate change adaptation in developing nations.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title, " <b>Restoration of Degraded Land using 'VEAZCOMUTECH': Case of Maroua I Municipality, Far North Region of Cameroon</b> ", is okay.	
<b>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.</b>	The abstract is overall well-rounded, effectively summarizing the study's objective, methodology, and findings. However, it does not explicitly address the wider implications of the research for future studies or practical applications. I recommend including a concluding sentence that emphasizes the potential of VEAZCOMUTECH for broader implementation in similar contexts or its importance for sustainable agriculture in degraded regions.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	The subsections are well-organized, addressing essential components such as materials, methods, results, and discussion. However, the results section could benefit from the inclusion of subheadings that align with the various metrics being assessed, such as plant growth, leaf length, and crop yield, to enhance clarity and structure.	
<b>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.</b>	The manuscript is scientifically robust and based on comprehensive experimental research. The VEAZCOMUTECH technique is well-articulated, and the findings are supported by quantitative data, including plant growth rates and the counts of leaves and flowers. This effectively illustrates the technique's success in enhancing soil fertility. The presence of control plots further enhances the credibility of the results by enabling a clear comparison between the treated and untreated areas.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	The references are relevant and sufficient, though a few more recent studies on sustainable agriculture and land restoration techniques could further strengthen the literature review.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language is largely appropriate for academic discourse; however, there are some grammatical concerns, especially regarding sentence structure and punctuation. Conducting thorough proofreading to improve clarity and consistency would significantly enhance readability and ensure a smoother flow of the text.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The figures and tables are helpful, although some visual aids, like the experimental plots, could be better labeled to facilitate interpretation.</li> <li>Certain content in the introduction reiterates points already presented in the abstract, which could be condensed to make the paper more concise.</li> </ul>	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Pragalbh Tiwari</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>College of Forestry, Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture, Technology and Sciences, India</b>