

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_122712
Title of the Manuscript:	Green Initiatives for Climate Change Mitigation in Palakkad District of Kerala
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>
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.	This manuscript addresses the emerging and important topic of comparing food forests and Miyawaki forests, which holds significant relevance for urban planners and decision-makers. The study has the potential to contribute valuable insights into different forestation techniques, aiding in the development of sustainable urban environments. However, after a thorough review, I have determined to Reject (with repairable deficiencies and may be reconsidered) due to the manuscript's methodological flaws, inadequate literature review and insufficient discussion of the results	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No, the current title does not accurately reflect the content of the manuscript. Additionally, the methodology section references a different title than the main title, leading to inconsistency. The current title's focus on climate change mitigation is too broad. A more appropriate title would be "Comparative Analysis of Food Forest and Miyawaki Forest Techniques: A Case Study from Kerala, India."	
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 is not comprehensive as it fails to include key results of the study. It is recommended that the authors revise the abstract to clearly present the major findings of the paper, providing readers with a concise overview of the study's outcomes.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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 lacks scientific robustness and technical soundness due to insufficient citations and a lack of argumentation based on existing literature. Proper scientific discourse requires the authors to engage with previous studies, compare and contrast their findings, and provide a well-supported discussion with clear and concise methodological framework. This manuscript falls short in these areas which lacks the standards of scientific publication.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No, the references cited in the manuscript are insufficient. The authors are strongly encouraged to incorporate recent and relevant citations, particularly in the discussion section, to enhance the credibility and depth of their research.	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Language used is good.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Introduction Section: The introduction effectively sets the context of the study, but there are critical areas that need to be addressed. For instance, the statement "Urban areas account for 78% of carbon emissions and 60% of residential water use" is impactful, but it is essential to cite credible sources to substantiate these claims. Additionally, while discussing Miyawaki forests, it is important to acknowledge some criticisms of this approach, such as its dense growth hindering human access and potentially altering wildlife movement and pollination patterns. This will provide a more balanced view and set the stage for this research. Furthermore, I suggest including clear definitions and elaborations of both food forests and Miyawaki forests, as well as highlighting any research gaps or problems the study aims to address.</p> <p>Methodology Section: The methodology is a crucial component of any research paper, and unfortunately, the current version of this section is underdeveloped, with only 94 words dedicated to it. Key information is missing, including a brief overview of the study area, its biophysical and geographical characteristics, and a map of the study area. Author should also provide detailed information on the plots, such as when they were established, how long the data was collected (day, month, or year), and whether control plots were included. It is also important to clarify whether both types of plots were established simultaneously. Furthermore, the paper lacks details on how data was collected, the equipment used, and the methods employed for data analysis. A comprehensive rewrite of this section is necessary to provide readers with a clear understanding of the research process.</p> <p>Result and Discussion Section: The results are not presented in a consistent or coherent manner. Important topics such as ground cover, temperature, infiltration, and cultural and environmental practices are introduced directly in the results section without any prior explanation in the introduction. It is crucial to explain how these parameters were measured and analyzed. For instance, when mentioning that "some living mulches were found to increase populations of the natural enemies of crop pests," author should explain how the presence of pests was identified and how this data was collected. Similarly, for claims about species like earthworms, beetles, and other insects contributing to soil fertility, it is important to detail how these observations were made and what methods were used. When discussing tree foliage cover in food forests, it is necessary to clarify how the canopy distance was determined and what techniques were adopted. Specific measurements, such as temperature differences and water infiltration rates have not been mentioned which should be explicitly stated along with the methods used for testing. The overall health of Miyawaki forests compared to food forests is mentioned, but without explanation of how this was assessed, the claim lacks credibility. Additionally, the discussion section needs significant revision. It should compare and contrast your findings with past studies and provide an argument that situates your results within the broader field of research. Please re-write this whole section with effective arguments.</p>	

PART 2:

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

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ashok Parajuli
Department, University & Country	Nepal