

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_91245
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Constraints encountered by Banana Growers in Adopting Water Management Practices using Henry Garrett Ranking Technique
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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There should be uniformity in writing the capital letters and small letters in the title head. If others are beginning with capital words then rewrite "encountered" as "Encountered", and "using" as "Using". Abstract- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What is the background of the study. - write revenue blocks in place of firkas. Check grammatical mistakes such as singulars, plurals etc. Like two blocks was selected should be two blocks were selected. - Conclusion needs more refinement. Was there any recommendation given to the farmers. From key words do remove the word Vellore. Introduction: Give references when you cite a fact, e.g. India are a global agricultural powerhouse. How we can say it. We need a reference for its justification. The Banana should be Banana (check the usage of the as a prefix)." First crop grown" is a fact and needs a reference for its justification. - The study involved the human subjects and their views were gathered during the study. What about Human subject protection. Where is the ethics committee clearance for this study. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Discussion part need more studies as references to substantiate the results of the study. - Grammatical mistakes throughout the script need revision. 	
Optional/General comments	<p>This is a remarkable study conducted. Though, the way it has been texted does not prove its worthiness. So, try to rewrite the whole script with emphasis on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Writing a background which shall make a justification for taking up this study. - Taking care of grammatical mistakes. - Explaining that why ethical clearance is not applicable. - Discussion part needs more studies for justification of your study findings. <p>The most important point is that was any sort of recommendation or public action was taken with the results of this study.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ajay Kumar Singh
Department, University & Country	India