

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_123684
Title of the Manuscript:	Rejuvenation Of Coastal Sandy Soils Through Organics
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.	Organics play a vital role in soil fertility The coastal sandy soils sustain agricultural crops but poor water holding capacity, low organic matter and high leaching capacity lead to low yield in crops. Therefore, a sustainable management system for improving fertility and productivity of the coastal sandy soils needs to be developed. Hence the manuscript is important in contemporary agriculture.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Partially suitable and can be changed to reflect the research aspects of the study in the 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.	Yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Corrections in some sub sections and structure which are not appropriate are suggested in the manuscript	
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 throws light on importance of usage of organics in sandy soils to sustain agriculture and yield of crops. Moreover the locally available organic sources have been utilised indicating effective natural resource management.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient but latest 10 years references can be mentioned and if possible wherever available DOI should be mentioned in the references section	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	All the corrections suggested in the manuscript has to be attended to before manuscript is accepted for publication	

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:	Harish Shenoy
Department, University & Country	India