

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_95907
Title of the Manuscript:	Adaptation strategies of farming communities against climate induced changes in Chilika lake wetland ecosystem of Odisha
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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Abstract: -Kindly check if the highlighted line highlighting the said results has not been misconstrued. I found it difficult to understand what authors were trying to depict despite getting the drift. -The abstract must be kept between 150-250 words. It must be brief, concise and coax readers. -Aspects which are not so relevant must be removed. The abstract must have a concluding sentence which highlights the significance and contribution of this study to sectoral players.</p> <p>Introduction: -Kindly enrich the introductory section by some standardized theories linked to Ecosystem based Approaches (EbA), climate vulnerability, adaptation and mitigation definitions can be integrated briefly in a paragraph, sustainable livelihood frameworks and sustainable development goals. -Again, early studies with similar scope conducted in other countries or from a global perspective could be integrated briefly to show research progress on what's done so far, and what's unknown yet important to be studied that is currently driving the current study objectives.</p> <p>Methodology: -Source or citation for Fig.1 has been cited wrongly. The year of publication must be added -The image quality of Fig. 1 is very poor. The wording is blur or difficult to read. If the authors can replace the said image, it did be better. -Lines 122-124: It's strange how authors claim the land-use map was derived from satellite imagery with follow-up statistics when they cite «Chilika Development Authority, Bhubaneswar...as source for the land use map. Clarity needs to be given here and rephrased if that secondary data (i.e., land use map) was acquired from the said institution. -If the authors generated Fig. 2 or the land use maps by themselves, they must provide the source of data acquisition, type of imagery, image pre-processing and enhancement, resolution, row/path, type of classification and data analysis used in the methodology section to support the said map generated. -same here. Source or citation for Fig.2 is wrong. It needs to be corrected by adding the year of publication -What was the sample size or fraction? How was the sample size or respondents selected? -Is the selected target group representative enough to draw conclusions of the entire study area and its inhabitants? -Did authors consider bias judgements? Does the bias judgements influence the validity or reliability in anyway? -What probabilistic sampling technique was employed: purposive, snowball, random, convenient and so on? **Is there any justification as to why this area or understudied areas were selected? These questions need to be clearly answered and integrated in the manuscript.</p> <p>Equations: -Kindly use Math function or insert equation to type or insert all equations in this manuscript. -Again, all equations and variables must be numbered in an orderly manner. -Line 164: Specific version of the software (i.e., STATA) must be state here.</p> <p>Results and Discussion -Authors can enrich the discussion aspect by linking or establishing a correlation between variables like educational background/awareness levels to the development or employment of some adaptation strategies. Other variables like income levels and adaptation capacity or vulnerability levels could equally be played with or critically assessed within the scope of correlation to enrich the discussion section. Here, the notion is higher incoming earning individuals/households are less vulnerable to climate hazards/impacts with a higher adaptive capacity level and vice versa for poor/low-income level individuals.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Moderate to major grammatical defects and syntax errors were identified throughout the manuscript. Few were corrected. Authors are advised to thoroughly correct or revise the entire manuscript to improve the overall nature of the manuscript.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is generally informative. Some major comments have been raised with other revisions in rack changes to assist or guide authors improve the manuscript for reconsideration or acceptance.	

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:	Isaac Sarfo
Department, University & Country	Research Institute for History of Science and Technology, Nanjing University of Information Science and Technology, China