

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_96552
Title of the Manuscript:	Positive Effect of Natural Resources Management Interventions on Bio-Physical Indicators in Polla Watershed Project of Srikakulam District, Andhra Pradesh, India
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 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	This manuscript is well and good at innovation and clears the clarity of the reader. It is well structured and well written. The author does a good job of presenting a highly technical and complicated process in an easy-to-understand manner. Authors need to cross check the reference section by addressing the cited contents in the introduction and related work part. The introduction must be an extended version of the abstract. The authors must elaborate on the points highlighted on the abstract and give supportive ideas and references. The conclusions in this manuscript are primitive. Rewrite your conclusions. References aren't formatted according to rules.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Maad M. Mijwil
Department, University & Country	Baghdad College of Economic Sciences University, Iraq