

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Agriculture</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_125483
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Addressing Climate Change: The Role of Agriculture in Greenhouse Gas Mitigation</b>
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

<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)
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.	The subject discussed is in line with current research. In fact, the analysis of the effect of certain agricultural practices can help in understanding possible solutions to address climate change.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is suitable	
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 article is complete but I suggest making it more appealing. I suggest improving it so that it captures the attention of the possible reader. This can be done by improving the statement of the problem, the exposition of the solutions and above all by better communicating the purpose of the manuscript. Moreover, I suggest to improve the English.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	In my opinion, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are incorrect. I suggest leaving a general introduction, and insert a section listing conventional agricultural practices and their negative impacts on the soil and the environment. Then I would insert a part explaining conservation and alternative farming practices and their benefits. Finally, a conclusion can be inserted with some future perspectives and suggestions for future research.	
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 scientific basis on which the manuscript is based is scientifically sound and technically sound as it underpins studies on conservation agriculture practices and the reduction of greenhouse gases produced by intensive agricultural activities. However, the manuscript at this time lacks the necessary soundness in communicating the topic. Therefore, I suggest that sections of the manuscript be greatly implemented with much more information and a more specific and comprehensive literature search.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are not sufficient, they are also very backward. To enhance the value of the manuscript, I suggest focusing on more recent articles as the subject matter is very much in vogue in the scientific community.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	English have to be improved	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

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

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Valentina Quintarelli
Department, University & Country	University of Ferrara, Italy