

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_100299
Title of the Manuscript:	CREATION OF GEOSPATIAL DATABASE AND ESTIMATION OF IRRIGATION WATER REQUIREMENT OF A CANAL COMMAND IN GAYATHRI IRRIGATION PROJECT, KERALA
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community, and it deals with an interesting topic, how agriculture and livestock adapt to climate change to ensure food products for the Asian people, where the phenomenon of hunger and lack of food is very frequent.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title of the manuscript is suitable.</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract is understood.</p> <p>4. More or less the subsections and the structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5. Yes. I think that the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. Not, the references are not sufficient and not recent, there is the part of the references has to be checked carefully because there are references in the text and they are not in the bibliography and vice versa, in the manuscript you can find all my comments.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes. The language/English quality of the manuscript is quite suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>All my comments are in the text of the manuscript, please check them. I see that the manuscript can accept it like this and it would be publishable in your journal.</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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Aziz Benhamrouche
Department, University & Country	Ferhat Abbas University Setif1, Algeria