

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Soil Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ASRJ_84969
Title of the Manuscript:	Agricultural culture between perspectives and production trends of adaptation to climate change
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalasrj.com/index.php/ASRJ/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>Abstract:</p> <p>-The main aim or specific objectives of the study is unclear in the abstract.</p> <p>-Author (s) can reduce the introductory aspect in the abstract and state clearly what the main objective (s) of the study is/are, along with the approach/methodology used in analysing data.</p> <p>Introduction:</p> <p>-Authors can rephrase, delete or rewrite the first sentence or line in the introduction. It is inappropriate to begin an introduction on that note. It is unclear as a result of sentence construction, and misleading as readers might mistake it for the study's main finding, despite the said line being an assertion from another study.</p> <p>-The introduction needs to be restructured to entail: Brief background to the concepts of the study, theories anchoring the study, research progress (what is known about the scope of the study internationally and domestically, and what is unknown but important to be studied), contribution/significance of the study to the international research community, farmers and other sectoral players.</p> <p>-Authors should not forget to reinstate the main objective (s) of the study in the last paragraph. Gaps identified in existing studies is what's driving the current study</p> <p>Methodology:</p> <p>-Authors stated in the 4th line or 3rd sentence that "Crops capture a large amount of CO₂.....". This assertion or claim must be substantiated, along with the source or reference.</p> <p>-The materials and methods section should solely entail methods or strategies used in assessing data. Kindly move (restructuring) section 2.1 along with the other details (Figures 1-3) to the results and discussion section.</p> <p>-Figure 2: Multifunctional protection zones-The key or legend is wrongly placed. Authors can improve the image by placing the key/legend below or beside the axis. Some of the words in the legends looks covered and not good enough for a scientific study.</p> <p>-Authors can design a flowchart or analytical framework that captures or describes the main themes linked to the objectives, underlying theories/concepts, methodology/data analysis strategies, challenges/limitations and opportunities to give readers a general view of what the study is entirely about with linkages.</p> <p>Results & Discussion:</p> <p>-Authors need to write the full meaning of abbreviated words like CAP, UE (Table 1)....before subsequently using its abbreviated forms. Ensure uniformity and consistency for other abbreviations throughout the manuscript.</p> <p>-Authors need to discuss results pertaining to the existing literature highlighting the positives, weaknesses/limitations, along with opportunities. Current discussion is too</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>shallow. Results and discussion could be ordered based on the study objectives as headers and sub-headers for clarity, consistency and precision. I see some sections suited for the discussion have been placed in the concluding section. I suggest authors separate the discussion from the results section.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>- Kindly move all discussion aspects in the conclusion, and place it in the discussion section.</p> <p>-Must constitute solely the main findings of the study briefly, importance or significance of the study's findings, possible areas for further research; thus, areas the present study couldn't capture or limitations/weaknesses of the study.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>General comments:</p> <p>-Authors need to check the proficiency level of the paper as moderate grammatical defects and syntax errors were detected throughout the manuscript.</p> <p>References:</p> <p>-There are several defects in the conclusion. Authors must check the journal's template or style and adhere to it. Example: Reference 1 has been wrongly cited. Authors should check templates on how to reference web-based works/studies/documents.</p> <p>-Several inconsistencies in the references. Authors must check the journal's required format and effect the needed corrections.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>The manuscript is generally informative and could be considered for publication</p>	

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:	Isaac Sarfo
Department, University & Country	Research Institute for History of Science & Technology, School of Law and Public Affairs, Nanjing University of Information Science and Technology, China