

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_100137
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF RAINFALL AND TEMPERATURE VARIABILITY ON GREEN GRAM YIELD IN THARAKA SOUTH SUB COUNTY, THARAKA NITHI COUNTY, KENYA
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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, the manuscript is relevant for the scientific community has it adressed the productivity of a very important legume crop in Kenya under the current challenge of climate change. The findings of this research give a pathways for further research to explore adaptation options for the legume crop to climate change.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title corresponds with the content of the manuscript. It is very clear the title.</p> <p>3. Yes the abstract is very well written and the problem is very clearly stated with a good conclusion. But I suggest that the authors add a statement to demonstrate for what objective the research was undertaken. See my comments in the manuscript</p> <p>4. Yes, the subsection and the structure of the manuscript are correct. We have the different standard sections of a research paper that are introduction, material and methods, results and discussion with a conclusion remark.</p> <p>5. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct. The authors used a strong methodology for achieving the results presented. Also, the authors used strong statistical analysis. The results are very well discussed and very clear.</p> <p>6. Yes, the references are very correct and recent. But I suggest the authors to strictly follow the guideline of the journal related to the references</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Coulibaly Yacouba Noël
Department, University & Country	Institut de l'Environnement et de Recherches Agricoles, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique et Technologique, Burkina Faso