

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_123746
Title of the Manuscript:	A Review on sustainable agriculture development through organic farming.
Type of the Article	Review Article

#### 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>
<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>	<p>The area of your study addresses the pressing issues related to sustainable agriculture; however, it lacks a thorough examination of the strategies, approaches, and implications of sustainable agriculture on a global scale. It would be beneficial to highlight how these elements are interconnected and their significance for the future of agriculture.</p> <p>Additionally, the study does not cover any relevant policies or schemes that emphasize the importance of organic farming. Including such information would strengthen your argument and provide valuable context.</p>	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	<p>Not</p> <p>The Title can be reframed with Organic Farming a Pathway to Achieve Sustainable Agriculture Development: A Comprehensive Review</p>	
<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 of the article has to be modified by answering the research objective. (For instance findings of the article).	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	No	
<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>	<p>After carefully reading the full manuscript reviewer did not feel something fresh information was provided by the author through his/her study. The manuscript is neither scientifically robust nor technically sound.</p> <p>The introduction is too brief. The introduction is about 600-700 words.</p> <p>Figures and tables must be mentioned in the body text</p> <p>No discussion part is found in the manuscript.</p> <p>All the citations and references are not as per the author's guidelines.</p> <p>Some citation details are not found in the reference list.</p>	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	The authors used nearly 20-year-old references, which he needs to replace with new articles not less than five years old.	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	For non-mother tongue, Proofreading from the USA, UK, Canada, or Australia is needed. All manuscripts must be written in clear and grammatically correct English (U.S.)	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Serious Major revision.	

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<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>Shivanand Pawar</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>CDOE JAIN Deemed to be University, India</b>