

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_124386
Title of the Manuscript:	Addressing the Sustainability Issues in Tea Production through attending the principles of Regenerative Farming Practices with the Adoption of Inhana Rational Farming (IRF) Technology in the Barak Valley (Cachar) Tea Growing Zone of Assam, India – A Case Study of 10 years.
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript provides critical insights into the sustainability challenges facing the tea industry, particularly in the Barak Valley region of Assam. It introduces innovative solutions through regenerative farming practices and Inhana Rational Farming (IRF) technology, offering a comprehensive approach to addressing soil health, pest management, and crop productivity issues. I appreciate the manuscript for its well-documented long-term study, which highlights the successful application of sustainable farming methods. This work is valuable for the scientific community, as it showcases how regenerative practices can lead to improved agricultural sustainability and economic viability, even in vulnerable regions</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The current title of the article, "<i>Addressing the Sustainability Issues in Tea Production through Attending the Principles of Regenerative Farming Practices with the Adoption of Inhana Rational Farming (IRF) Technology in the Barak Valley (Cachar) Tea Growing Zone of Assam India – A Case Study of 10 Years</i>," is quite long and could be more concise while still conveying the key information. A more suitable alternative could be: "Sustainable Tea Production in Assam: A 10-Year Case Study of Inhana Rational Farming and Regenerative Practices in Barak Valley"</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract of the article is generally comprehensive, as it provides an overview of the key issues in the Barak Valley tea industry, the challenges faced by tea growers, and the introduction of the Inhana Rational Farming (IRF) technology. It effectively summarizes the 10-year study, highlighting the improvements in crop productivity, pesticide reduction, and sustainability. However, there are some areas where improvements could be made for clarity and conciseness.</p> <p>Suggested Improvements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Streamline the Content: The abstract is slightly too detailed. It could benefit from focusing on the core findings rather than going into too much background about the tea industry. For example, the specifics about EU standards for pesticide residues could be condensed, leaving room for more emphasis on the results and their implications. 2. Highlight Key Results More Clearly: The abstract mentions a reduction in pesticide load and improved crop productivity but does not clearly emphasize the specific quantitative results upfront. Including more specific figures or a brief mention of the environmental and economic impacts would make the abstract more impactful. 3. Clarify the Significance of IRF Technology: The unique aspects of the IRF technology and its contribution to sustainable farming should be briefly explained upfront, as this is the central theme of the paper. 4. Reduce Overemphasis on Background: The abstract spends a lot of time explaining the background of tea production challenges in India. While this is important, it should be more concise so that more attention can be given to the study's outcomes. 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript has a well-defined structure, with clearly outlined sections, which is important for scientific clarity. However, there are a few areas where the structure and subsections could be adjusted for better readability and flow. Below are some suggestions to improve the organization:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comprehensive Coverage: The manuscript covers essential topics, including the background of tea production challenges, materials and methods, results, and conclusions, which provides a solid foundation for the reader. 2. Detailed Explanation of Methods and Results: The materials and methods section is thorough, offering a clear description of how the research was conducted, which is important for reproducibility. 	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound, as it is based on a long-term, 10-year study that provides significant data on the effects of Inhana Rational Farming (IRF) technology in tea production. The methodology is detailed and transparent, with clear explanations of soil health management, plant health management, and the analysis of pesticide load and residue. The use of validated scientific protocols, such as the SWOT analysis and colorimetric assay tests, further</p>	

Review Form 3

	enhances the credibility of the findings. Additionally, the study's focus on regenerative farming practices and the quantifiable results in crop productivity and pesticide reduction make it a valuable contribution to agricultural sustainability research.	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>=</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript appear to be a mix of both recent and older sources, which is appropriate given the long-term nature of the study. However, while there are some recent references, a stronger focus on more current literature (from the last 5-7 years) could improve the relevance of the manuscript, especially considering that the fields of regenerative agriculture and sustainable farming have seen significant advancements recently.</p> <p>Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increase the Number of Recent References: Many of the references are older than 10 years, especially those related to soil and plant health. It would be beneficial to include more recent studies that address advancements in regenerative farming and sustainable agriculture technologies. 2. Add More Global Context: While the manuscript focuses on the Barak Valley in India, including references from global case studies on sustainable tea production or regenerative farming in other crops would add broader relevance to the manuscript. This would position the findings within a global context, highlighting their broader applicability. 3. Suggested Additional References: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Studies on advancements in regenerative agriculture, soil carbon sequestration, or sustainable farming technologies in tea or similar crops. o Recent reviews on plant health management or pesticide reduction strategies in agriculture, especially those focused on mitigating climate change impacts. 	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language of the manuscript is generally clear and comprehensible, but there are areas where it could be improved for scholarly communication. Some sentences are quite long and complex, which may hinder readability. Minor grammatical issues and awkward phrasing are also present in certain sections, which can affect the overall flow.</p> <p>Suggested Revisions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Simplify Long Sentences: Some sentences are overly long and could be split into shorter, more concise ones for easier comprehension. 2. Improve Clarity in Technical Descriptions: Certain technical terms and descriptions, such as those in the methodology, could be reworded for better clarity. For example, instead of writing in passive voice or using complex jargon, more straightforward language can be used to make the content accessible to a wider audience. 3. Proofreading for Grammar and Style: The manuscript would benefit from a thorough proofreading to correct minor grammatical issues, awkward phrasing, and punctuation errors 	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Flow and Structure: The manuscript is well-organized but could benefit from slight reordering to enhance the flow of sections. For example, combining related sections (such as Soil Health and Plant Health Management) under a broader heading would streamline the content.</p> <p>Broader Context in Conclusion: The conclusion could emphasize how the findings could be applicable to other regions or crops facing similar challenges. This would highlight the broader relevance of the study beyond the Barak Valley.</p>	

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

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Deepthi Amarasensa
Department, University & Country	Tea Research Institute of Sri Lanka, Sri Lanka