

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_95669
Title of the Manuscript:	Study on Crop Diversification based on Long term Rain fall analysis of Dry farming tracts in southern India
Type of the 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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. Yes, but it needs to be further developed to show its scientific importance. For example, it will be highly recommended to highlight the interest of this study on the future of cultivation in the studied areas. Thus, it is necessary to propose a suitable and adequate cultivation plan according to the results recorded. 2. Yes. 3. The abstract section must be rewritten giving the main contribution of the work performed and presented in the article. The abstract summarizes all the information of the paper. It includes the conclusions as well as the statement of the original problem. 4. yes, but the section: material and methods must be developed and described in detail. 5. yes, it is acceptable. 6. Many references are quite old. Therefore, it will be recommended to search and add some recent relevant reference documents.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There are some typos and English grammatical errors in this manuscript. I recommend checking for these issues.	
Optional/General comments		

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Wafa Terouzi
Department, University & Country	Hight School of Technology, Sultan Moulay Slimane University, Morocco