

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_125902
Title of the Manuscript:	Dynamics of Soil Properties under Jhum Cultivation: A Review
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">REVIEW OF THE PAPER <i><u>Dynamics of Soil Properties under Jhum Cultivation: A Review</u></i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">Title: The title is adequate for the content, informative. However, the research paper deals with the idea of soil properties of Andhra Pradesh. Since it is a micro study, it would have been better, if the selected area could have been mentioned in the title.Abstract: The abstract is comprehensive by itself as it details the crucial and essential information of the article is present within it.Logic The paper is logically consistent, however a little more empirical research and field study could have been better.Structure and length: The overall structure of the article is well organized and well balanced, with proper analysis of soil indicators. However, few soil sampling analysis, done with soil testing kits, would have enhanced the subjectivity of the paper. The author is requested to keep this in mind, for future papers, dealing with agricultural and soil anatomy.Literature Review: A comprehensive and relevant literature review is not found. Thus it is very difficult to analyse whether the paper identifies the gaps of previous literature along with the present one while determining the rationale of the study.Research Design and Methodology: The appropriateness and robustness of the research design is found adequately. However, the objectives of the paper could have been more specified. A little bit of sample study and proper elaboration of sampling methods could have made this study more comprehensive; otherwise the research is well described and suitable for addressing the research question.Data Analysis and Interpretation: The study does possess a proper way of data analysis. The presentation of results are also done. The study could have been more adaptive if along with the	

Review Form 3

	<p>scientific names of the plants, a few local Indian names could have been added in the parentheses. Apart from the table, a little quantitative or thematic representations could have been better. However, the results are presented clearly and are interpreted appropriately in the context of the research aims.</p> <p>8. References and Citations: The accuracy and relevance of the references are adequate that are cited in the paper. However, few of the references within the paper, are a bit back dated. However, it is not hampering the essence of the paper. (Table 1 , reference is of 2005).</p> <p>9. Conclusions and Implications: The conclusions were framed properly with proper recommendations as it will help the policy makers for further research in this particular field.</p> <p>10. Writing Style and Presentation: The overall quality of writing, including grammar, punctuation and formatting seems to be fine.</p> <p>11. Scientific quality rating</p> <p>1. Novelty and originality</p> <p>The paper basically deals with a thorough analysis of various aspects of changes in soil texture due to Jhum Cultivation. The author has tried to preserve the novelty and originality, by interpreting his /her opinion regarding the soil characteristics.</p> <p>2. Importance and impact:</p> <p>The present paper can be a source of referral and of significant importance to agriculturalists, geographers and pedologists. The paper have a chance to be referred in future.</p> <p>3. Relevance:</p> <p>Overall rating and recommendation</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>(1) The article may become acceptable after minor content revisions . It is a good article.</p> <p>Reviewer's remarks to the authors</p> <p>As per the full paper is concerned, it is a good paper as a specific aspect of pedology is being covered. The paper positively deals with proper explanation of Jhum Cultivation and its effect on soil properties. It is a good paper, as the author has made a 360 degree appraisal of the soil health related to Jhum Cultivation.</p>	
--	---	--

Review Form 3

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kathakali Bandopadhyay
Department, University & Country	Subarnarekha Mahavidyalaya, India