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**PART 1: Comments**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Reviewer’s comment**  **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | **Author’s Feedback** (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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | The manuscript is relevant in policy Advocacy but not not in practice. Regenerative agriculture and greening has got more to do with carbon capture and storage, though carbon sequestration was mainstreamed in the manuscript but only covered the superficial aspects. Natural fixers and binders for carbon capture and storage are the real strengths for greening and regeneration. Regeneration means replenishing what is lost due to solil erosion and mand made degradation with unsuitable agriculture practices implemented which harm the vigor and crop production including soil erosion. Through scientific innovation if enabling best practices are included then regeneration will be feasible and the paper need to high that in the review What are the ways and means and scientific advances being currently practiced be included. | Thank you for your insightful comments. The manuscript have been revised to include the discussions on carbon capture and storage, focusing the role of natural carbon fixers and binders in regenerative agriculture. Additionally, emerging scientific interventions that enable regeneration of soil health and biodiversity. These inclusions are done to highlight the strength and practical relevance of the paper alongside its policy perspective |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | Role of regenerative agriculture in resolving Climate change crisis | Shall be considerd |
| **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.** | Abstract is not comprehensive and needs a line or two on carbon capture and storage including scientific methodologies currently available for best practices in agriculture which can reduce climate change crises as well as drive regeneration of soil vigour and vitality for emissions reductions and natural fixation of carbon.  Author is requested to refine the abstract and make it more scientific | Thank you for your valuable feedback. The abstract has been revised to include the scientific methodologies related to carbon capture and storage. |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.** | Partially scientifically aligned and robust  Has scope for improvement if the feedback provided are duly addressed | Thank you for your valuable feedback. The suggestions have been included to enhance scientific alignment and overall improvement of the manuscript |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | References are precise and align with the content and context provided in the manuscript, however if methodologies related to regeneration are made available then further references can be addedto the review paper which shall be a emulation partake for others to align. Strengthen the methodologies available for best practices in the paper and accordingly add these references. | Thank you for your positive reply, I have incorporated recent studies to further strengthen the manuscript to reflect the latest development in regenerative agriculture |
| **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?** | It's fair as most of the text is referenced or is a citation of otherwork, not much of communication quality can be Commented for.Its acceptable and free from plagiarism as the author has provided all the sources and citation duly. | Thank you for your observation. Necessary revisions have been made. The citations have been duly retained; communication clarity has also been slightly refined wherever possible |
| **Optional/General** comments | Overall the manuscript is fair in content and context provided all the comments are addressed and included in the paper. The paper needs comprehensive changes for it to move towards publication.  My feedback on the manuscript importance is provided in the comments section. The author is advised to restructure the manuscript and keep the scientific advances in regeneration to forefront for strengthening the paper towards publication | Thank you for your constructive feedback. The manuscript has been thoroughly revised as per your suggestions, particularly restructuring the content and highlighting recent scientific advances in regenerative agriculture. Hope that this revised version aligns better with publication standards |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **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?** | *(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* |  |