

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_121279</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Reduces Arsenic Load in Winter Fodder Crops as Influenced by Shallow Tube Well and Pond Water Irrigation</b>
Type of the Article	

## Review Form 3

### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript titled "Reduces Arsenic Load in Winter Fodder Crops as Influenced by Shallow Tube Well and Pond Water Irrigation" holds significant importance for the scientific community. It sheds light on crucial methods to reduce arsenic contamination in winter fodder crops, providing valuable insights for agricultural practices. This research contributes to sustainable farming techniques, offering solutions to mitigate the impact of arsenic on crop quality and human health. The findings of this study have the potential to drive advancements in agricultural water management strategies, benefiting both farmers and consumers alike.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it is suitable.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	I think it's fine as it is ("Reduces Arsenic Load in Winter Fodder Crops as Influenced by Shallow Tube Well and Pond Water Irrigation").  But I had proposed a second alternative as: "Reduction of Arsenic Load in Winter Fodder Crops as Influenced by Shallow Tube Well and Pond Water Irrigation".	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The paper meets all standards regarding scientific accuracy. It is scientifically useful as it will help farmers (Farm Designers) to reduce the arsenic load in winter crops. While in the technical aspect it fulfills all the requirements that a scientific paper should have (Abstract, Introduction, materials and methods, results and conclusions, figures, tables and references).	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	I think the references are enough. What I would suggest is that the name of the journal, the volume and the link of the paper (doi) should be set.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, I think it is appropriate.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	I suggest that the name of the journal, volume lot and the link of the papers (doi) should be placed in the references.	

**Review Form 3**

**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>Mazllum Kamberi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Prishtina "Hasan Prishtina", Kosovo</b>