

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_99838</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Pokkali rice cultivation: An indigenous traditional rice cultivation method in Kerala</b>
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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. <b>The manuscript is interesting to ready but to the scientific community I doubt because it did not follow the scientific procedure in writing a manuscript.</b></p> <p>2. <b>The title of the article is suitable.</b></p> <p>3. <b>The abstract, though provided a description of the Pokali rice production system, the section lacks important components of a good abstract. For instance, there is no mention of the purpose of the study/manuscript, no identification of gaps or motivation behind the study.</b></p> <p>4. <b>The overall structure of the manuscript is poor since the sub-sections did not follow the lay down procedures of manuscripts.</b></p> <p>5. <b>I doubt if the manuscript is scientifically appropriate.</b></p> <p>6. <b>Quiet a number of the references are sufficient and recent.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes, the English language is standard and suitable for scholarly communications</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>I think the manuscript needs to be arranged according to the journal's guidelines to merit publication.</p>	

### 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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Faizal Adams</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Ghana</b>