

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_125483
Title of the Manuscript:	Addressing Climate Change: The Role of Agriculture in Greenhouse Gas Mitigation
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	This manuscript makes an important contribution to the scientific community by addressing the critical issue of climate change mitigation through agricultural practices. It highlights the significant role that agriculture plays in greenhouse gas emissions and presents a range of strategies, such as improved nutrient management, conservation tillage, and carbon sequestration, which are essential for reducing emissions. I appreciate how the manuscript emphasizes both the challenges and solutions, particularly focusing on organic farming and innovative technologies that can make a tangible difference. The detailed exploration of mitigation techniques provides valuable insights for researchers, policymakers, and farmers alike.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	YES	
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.	The abstract of the manuscript is fairly comprehensive, as it covers key points such as the role of agriculture in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, the impact of emissions like nitrous oxide (N ₂ O) and methane (CH ₄), and the potential for mitigation through strategies like improved nutrient management and conservation tillage(Ms_ARJA_125483).	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate for a scientific article addressing a complex issue like climate change mitigation in agriculture.	
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.	The manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound due to its strong reliance on well-established research and comprehensive data. It references credible sources, such as studies from the IPCC and other scientific bodies, providing a reliable foundation for its arguments regarding greenhouse gas (GHG) mitigation in agriculture(Ms_ARJA_125483). Additionally, the manuscript includes detailed explanations of key mitigation techniques, such as nutrient management, biochar application, and conservation tillage, all of which are supported by peer-reviewed studies and empirical data. The discussion of various GHG emissions and mitigation strategies is also precise and based on proven scientific principles, making the manuscript a technically sound contribution to the field of climate change and agriculture.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	YES, Nosuggestions	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	YES, No revision	
Optional/General comments	NA	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shivam Satyawan Madrewar
Department, University & Country	Mahatma Phule Krushi Vidyapeeth, India