

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_104449
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of Farmers' Respondents on Awareness and Knowledge of Climate Change in Agriculture in Nagaland State India
Type of the Article	Original research

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:

<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The topic of the research is practical and contemporary</p> <p>The abstract is adequate. It mentions the objective of this study, then the methodology followed by sampling and sample size, then the results, and ends with implications. Needs proofreading [see suggestions]</p> <p>Keywords are adequate</p> <p>The introduction and background are fair because they need validation with references. However, need to add how is this paper divided!!</p> <p>The methodology is adequate though brief. Suggestions were added for data analysis.</p> <p>The results are clear, with adequate data tables. Good to support the discussion.</p> <p>The discussion is adequate, clear, and streamlined. It is validated by the reported literature. However, needs a good proofreading and editing [see suggestions in the attached Manuscript]</p> <p>The conclusion is adequate. Limitations are not reported??? Must add</p> <p>Review carefully the write-up of the references for consistency, completeness, and to match the Journal's requirements. Add necessary citations suggested in the text.</p> <p>Proofreading is needed [see suggestions]</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.6

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:	Hussin Jose Hejase
Department, University & Country	Al Maaref University, Lebanon