

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_122881
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of changes in soil biology under Shisham based agroforestry system
Type of the Article	Short Research Articles

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>The manuscript could be of interest to the scientific community as it shows a marked difference in the soil microbiota between different cultivation systems. Highlighting the use of agroforestry over a conventional open system. In addition, it can be added that this was measured and evaluated with techniques that are easily implemented and repeatable in laboratories that are not very technical in microbiology or similar, which adds relevance for decision makers.</p> <p>Despite this, I find the article out of focus as it proposes to evaluate the functionality of the soil microbiome but ends by establishing differences between forms of cultivation.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title needs focus, perhaps mentioning the type or system to be evaluated or the region</p> <p>Something more focused could be Effects of cultivation practices and systems on the community of the rhizospheric soil microbiota in mustard</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 is of the "methodological" type. The author should summarize a little more details than are given in the corresponding section and comment a little more on his objectives, hypotheses and conclusions.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The sections and subsections by parts are not appropriate. In the introduction there is a gap between the broad and very good description of the importance of the soil microbiota and its functions with the relationship with the rhizosphere and its influence with crops in agroforestry, without agroforestry, and mustard specifically, perhaps a paragraph. I also find that the objective stated is not directly related to the work carried out, it should be more specific based on the design carried out.</p> <p>In the methodology you can reduce the use of tables when describing the culture media used, although it is not entirely necessary if you consider that the information is not easily available. It is necessary to correctly explain how you determined the analyses, what criteria you used, mention the bibliography used, and if you used specific software (subsection "statistical or data analysis").</p> <p>In the results I see images that say nothing except a brief description. The information in the tables was enough to demonstrate the idea, with the figures I can't understand what the idea is.</p> <p>The conclusions are not in line with the objectives set out in the introduction, but they are in line with the results obtained.</p>	
<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 scientific article is solid in terms of the experimental design and data analysis carried out. Therefore, the repeatability criterion is met as stated above. On the other hand, further development is needed in the different sections that involve developing the problem in an appropriate manner.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Yes, It is do</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, It is do	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Velazco Victor Nicolas
Department, University & Country	Instituto De Ecología y Desarrollo Sustentable, Argentina