

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.	First of all, the manuscript is very well written. The information collected and analysed in this manuscript entitled "Rejuvenation of Coastal Sandy Soils through Organics" is very well researched and properly conveyed. I have hope that it will prove to be a significant link in strive for restoration of degraded coastal agricultural areas of the country.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes it is very much 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 manuscript abstracts clearly defined the whole area of the work undertaken. However, it is mentioned in the conclusion that on top of other treatment combinations, a top dressing with fresh cow dung slurry @ 1kg per 10 litres is also best recommended to the farmers. This is not mentioned in the abstract and I believe it should also be addressed in the abstract.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript is well defined with proper subsections and structure	
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 interprets the collected data after a very thorough statistical analysis which is very much commendable. It also discusses various facets of soil fertility like soil organic carbon, EC, Ph, nutrient contents and its dynamics in sandy soils of coastal areas in a scientifically sound manner which is a very crucial area of research nowadays due to the ongoing problems of rise in sea water level and land loss in coastal areas.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references are properly written. However few corrections regarding mismatched names and years in the citations and references have been observed which i have mentioned in the manuscript for corrections. Some citations (Ismail and Ozawa, 2006; Slavich <i>et al.</i> , 2010) were not included in the reference but was cited. Thi, D.P., Hang, N.N.T., Viet, O.T., Van, L.N., Viet, A.N., Lan, P.D.T., Van, N.V., 2021. Sandy soil reclamation using biochar and clay-rich soil. J. Ecol. Eng. 22(6), pp.26 35. https://doi.org/10.12911/22998993/137445 was included in the reference but not found in the text citations. Therefore, these needs to be properly checked and corrected.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes the language quality is impeccable and the manuscript is very well written and easily understandable.	
Optional/General comments	As mentioned above in the comment for abstract, the conclusion part mentions that "top dressing with fresh cow dung slurry @ 1kg per 10 litres" can also be recommended to the farmers. But in the subsections, there is no mention or discussion of cowdung slurry. Therefore, it may seem to the readers that the author had simply added this part as a mistake. In my opinion, whether addition of cowdung slurry in this particular dose is a part of the Package of Practices Recommendation (Organic) of the Kerala Agricultural University or not should be properly explained. This will help clear up doubts for the readers and farmers in effectively implementing the recommendations suggested in the conclusion section.	

Review Form 3

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Keisham Dony Devi
Department, University & Country	Central Agricultural University, India