

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_115724
Title of the Manuscript:	IMPACT OF CLIMATE VARIABILITY AND EXTREMES ON CROP PRODUCTION
Type of the Article	

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>Yes, it is important because it collects and reviews a number of published studies related to climate change and crop productivity.</p> <p>The use of the word impact leads the reader to the expectation that he will see some numbers. "A review of the relationship" could do better. This being a review paper could best be represented by such a title.</p> <p>The abstract does not comprehensively address the reason why the author is doing the work. Some gap description could improve the section. The subsections are appropriate. However, in the introduction, the author could guide the reader how the paper is structured</p> <p>Yes, the manuscript is correct.</p> <p>Well, yes, although the author could do better without articles from 2000s and 1990s.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes. However, some sensationalized terms like "seriously, unprecedented and unequivocally" could be avoided. The paragraphs are also too long. They should be broken down. A paragraph should just convey one point, using the PEEL method.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>For a review paper, the paper is okay</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:	Fenwicks Shombe Musonye
Department, University & Country	Kenya