

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_99855
Title of the Manuscript:	PERCEPTION OF FARMERS ABOUT CLIMATE CHANGE IN UDAIPUR DISTRICT OF RAJASTHAN
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>)

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"> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Decision: Major revision</p> <p>I have carefully reviewed the manuscript. After careful reading, I show great interest. Your research is on an important topic (farmers perception on climate change), promoted across many countries as an efficient strategy to design appropriate climate change mitigation ways. The topic is very interesting. However, the manuscript needs the following revision before publication. The detailed comments are as follows:</p> <p>General comment</p> <p>You should ensure that the overall language in the manuscript is clear, correct, and unambiguous. Generally the manuscript is immature seems BSc student thesis.</p> <p>Abstract</p> <p>The abstract is needs to be improved. At the end of the abstract, readers would like to see some practical policy proposal input for future climate change mitigation plan. Please indicate some future policy input/implications derived from your results it could become an input for policy makers.</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>I think your introduction may not motivate reader. Kindly discussing any policy-level problem related to climate change. Why this study is necessary? What policy level problem this study is addressing? How the study is expected to provide any solution to that problem? The author should improve introduction section and explain generic information. Please kindly use more recent articles.</p> <p>Methodology</p> <p>It is better to include map of the study areas. Materials and methods are not described in sufficient details. In fact, this important section should be written in a manner to provide the reader with enough background to evaluate the research validity and how the results were recorded. I recommend you to systematically revise this section, in addition to specific reviewers' queries, provide the rationale behind the sample/study area selection, details on the methods used to collect data as well as the questionnaire tool. Finally, statistical methods applied need to be detailed, to advise the reader on data analyses carried out. Kindly do that. You can use chart, plot.</p> <p>Result and discussion</p> <p>Kindly incorporate implications or advantages of the new finding compared with discovered by past findings. This will ensure justice to the extant literature and evincing the superiority of the current findings over the past findings. How it can be sustainable?</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 1.7

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:	Kebede Habtegiorgis
Department, University & Country	Areka Agricultural Research Center, Ethiopia