

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | International Journal of Environment and Climate Change |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_IJECC_97641 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Feasibility Assessment of On Farm Water Harvesting Structures for Livelihood Security of Small and Marginal Farmers |
| 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments) | 1. This manuscript is not so very important for the international scientific community, but can be useful by the local region to see the socio-economic efficiency of the local society, it treats the side of the financial aids but it did not clarify well the state of the land 2. Title acceptable according to the content of the manuscript 3. Insufficient summary and requires more points to detail 4. Manuscript sections require sub-sections for more detail 5. The manuscript is correct in form and general methodology, but the content is insufficient 6. The references are well chosen and recent but the number (8) is insufficient It is considered that the author can expand this study and make a combination between the benefits of these infrastructures and the appropriate agricultural techniques thus increasing the number of beneficiaries chosen and the area to arrive at a reliable result. | |
| Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Quality fairly good to good (acceptable) | |
| Optional/General comments | The writing of this manuscript requires more detail concerning the diagnosis of the study area, climatic (especially with this amount of rainfall 970 mm) and socioeconomic of the study environment and it is better by figures and figures to see the initial state and the state of place after the use of these irrigation infrastructures to highlight the real benefits | |

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: | Tebani Mohamed |
| Department, University & Country | University of Chlef, Algeria |