

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_109704</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Assessing livelihood strategies pursued by small and marginal farmers of climate-vulnerable Assam State of India</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

## 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The concept of the manuscript would have a complimentary contribution to the growing scholarship addressing the diversification of livelihood for climate change resilience, if it is properly rewritten in a scientific sound manner. There are several sentences in the article that are unclear to read that should be edited for clarity and flow.</li> <li>2. The title should be modified into a precise, informative and attractive form to read.</li> <li>3. The abstract of this manuscript is less informative, unattractive and less efficient. The abstract should start with the impact of climate risk and vulnerability and why livelihood diversification among smallholder farmers matters. Authors should consider on describing the sampling procedure and the sampling technique clearly. The information given in the abstract is different from the other subsection of the manuscript.</li> <li>4. The subsections and numberings of subsections must be edited. For instance, on page five the heading and subheading number is not correct. The structure of the manuscript is inappropriate. In every subsection, especially the introduction part needs a rewrite. Introduction section should be written from general to the specific. In addition to that, I have observed that the introduction section focuses only in the study area that describing the importance of the study and its impact at global level. There are so many redundancies of sentences and ideas. There are missed subsections such as, study area description.</li> <li>5. The references are not sufficient and dates of majority of cited reference are not given which is hard to identify as recent or not. Especially the result and discussion section lacks references. How can a scientific study discuss a result without arguing with previous peer reviewed articles? There are many peer reviewed articles related to the topic of this manuscript. Thus the author should consider reviewing those papers. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generally the manuscript lacks scientific sound writing method and structure. The author must consider editing and rewriting the manuscript line by line. Reorganize the introduction section to improve on the logical flow. The result and discussion section lacks argument and reference. It has to answer the why? And So what? Questions. The conclusion section has not concluded the study properly. A conclusion comes from the result of the study and recommendation comes from what you have concluded. And how did the author be able to recommend without having a proper conclusion?</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>The English quality of the article is less efficient for scholarly communication. Major improvements should be done.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Author should make sure the sentences in the manuscript are grammatically correct and use scientific communicative words.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Tsion Fikadu</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia</b>