

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_119033
Title of the Manuscript:	Changes in Livelihood and Utilization Pattern of Farm Pond Owners in Drought Regions of Maharashtra, India
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>ABSTRACT</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The abstract clearly states the study's aim and the timeframe of the research. 2. It provides a good overview of the methodology, including sample size and data collection methods. 3. The key findings are presented with specific numerical results, which is commendable. 4. The conclusion effectively summarizes the broader implications of the study. <p>Areas for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Structure: The abstract could benefit from a more structured format, clearly delineating the background, methods, results, and conclusions. 2. Background: A brief sentence providing context for why this study is important (e.g., the challenges of drought-prone regions) would be beneficial. 3. Methods: More detail on how the indices were calculated or what they represent would be helpful. Information on the statistical analyses used is missing. 4. Results: While the numerical results are provided, there's no indication of statistical significance for most of them. the comparison between beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries is not clearly presented. 5. Implications: The broader implications of the study could be more explicitly stated. 6. Keywords: Consider adding more specific keywords related to the study's focus (e.g., drought-prone agriculture, gender empowerment). 7. Length: At 234 words, the abstract is slightly long. Consider condensing it to improve readability. <p>recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Restructure the abstract to clearly separate background, methods, results, and conclusions. 2. Add a brief sentence at the beginning to provide context for the study's importance. 3. Include a brief mention of the statistical analyses used. 4. Indicate the statistical significance of the results where applicable. 5. Clearly state how the results compare between beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. 6. Expand slightly on the implications of the findings for policy or practice. 7. Consider adding more specific keywords. 8. Try to condense the abstract to around 200-250 words for improved readability. <p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>the introduction provides a comprehensive background on the importance of farm ponds in drought-prone regions of Maharashtra, India. It effectively sets the context for the study and highlights the significance of the research. However, there are several areas where the introduction could be strengthened:</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The introduction effectively establishes the context of water scarcity in Maharashtra and the potential of farm ponds as a solution. 2. It provides a good overview of the benefits of farm ponds, including water management, crop diversification, and economic improvements. 3. The section cites relevant and recent literature, demonstrating awareness of current research in the field. <p>Areas for Improvement:</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>1. Research Gap: While the introduction provides a good background, it doesn't clearly state the specific research gap that this study aims to fill. The authors should explicitly state what is not known or what has not been studied in previous research.</p> <p>2. Objectives: The specific objectives of the study are not clearly stated. These should be explicitly mentioned towards the end of the introduction.</p> <p>3. Structure: The introduction could benefit from a more logical flow. Consider restructuring to move from the general problem of drought in Maharashtra to the specific solution of farm ponds, and then to the particular focus of this study.</p> <p>4. Relevance to Climate Change: Given that this is submitted to a journal on Environment and Climate Change, the introduction should more explicitly link farm ponds to climate change adaptation strategies.</p> <p>5. Theoretical Framework: The introduction would benefit from briefly mentioning any theoretical framework or model that guides this research.</p> <p>6. Policy Context: While the '***Magel Tyala Shet Tale***' initiative is mentioned, more details on the policy context would be beneficial.</p> <p>7. Language and Style: There are some grammatical errors and awkward phrasings that should be addressed. A thorough proofreading is recommended.</p> <p>8. Consistency in Referencing: Ensure consistent use of et al. (it should be italicized throughout).</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Clearly state the research gap and the specific objectives of this study.2. Restructure the introduction for better flow and coherence.3. Strengthen the link between farm ponds and climate change adaptation.4. Include a brief mention of the theoretical framework guiding the research.5. Provide more details on relevant policies and initiatives.6. Conduct a thorough proofreading to improve language and grammar.7. Ensure consistency in referencing style. <p>MATERIAL AND METHODS</p> <p>While the section provides a basic outline of the study design and methodology, there are several areas that require significant improvement and clarification:</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The study design (ex post facto) is clearly stated.2. The sampling process is described, providing information on the selection of regions, districts, blocks, and villages.3. The total sample size is clearly stated (320 respondents). <p>Areas for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Study Design: While the ex post facto design is mentioned, there's no explanation of why this design was chosen or its appropriateness for the research questions.2. Sampling Method: The selection process for districts and blocks is described as "purposive", but no criteria for this selection are provided beyond "highest number of farm ponds". The random selection process for villages and respondents needs more detail. What type of randomization was used? It's unclear how the sample was split between beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries.3. Data Collection: The "structured schedule" for data collection needs more explanation. What specific questions or measures were included? The time frame for data collection is not mentioned.4. Measures: While several indices are listed (livestock composition index, WPTUR, REGI, etc.), there's no explanation of how these were calculated or what they measure specifically. The reference to Sharda et al. (2012) for these measures is insufficient without more detail.5. Data Analysis: There's no mention of how the data was analyzed. What statistical tests or analyses were performed?6. Ethical Considerations: There's no mention of ethical considerations or whether the study received ethical approval.7. Limitations:	
--	---	--

Review Form 1.7

	<p>The section does not address potential limitations of the chosen methodology.</p> <p>8. Writing Style: The writing is somewhat disjointed and lacks proper flow. Some sentences are incomplete or grammatically incorrect.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Provide a rationale for the chosen study design and sampling method.2. Clarify the selection criteria for districts and blocks.3. Explain in detail the randomization process for village and respondent selection.4. Provide more information on the data collection tool, including example questions if possible.5. Explain each measure (index) in detail, including how it was calculated and what it represents.6. Include a data analysis section describing the statistical methods used.7. Address ethical considerations, including whether the study received ethical approval.8. Discuss potential limitations of the methodology.9. Improve the overall writing style and grammar for clarity and coherence.10. Consider adding a figure or flowchart to illustrate the sampling process. <p>RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The section provides a comprehensive overview of the changes in various livelihood indicators following farm pond adoption.2. The use of tables to present data is effective and helps in clear visualization of results.3. The discussion includes comparisons with previous studies, which helps to contextualize the findings. <p>Areas for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Statistical Analysis: While t-values and p-values are provided in Table 1, there's no explanation of the statistical tests used. For other tables, no statistical analysis is presented to support the comparisons made.2. Data Presentation: Some tables (e.g., Table 2 and Table 6) could benefit from additional columns showing frequencies alongside percentages. Consider using graphs or charts to visualize some of the data, particularly for changes over time.3. Discussion Depth: The discussion of results is often descriptive rather than analytical. More in-depth analysis of why certain changes occurred would strengthen the paper. The implications of these findings for policy and practice could be more thoroughly explored.4. Structure: The section would benefit from clearer subheadings to guide the reader through different aspects of the results. Consider separating the Results and Discussion into two distinct sections for clarity.5. Methodology Linkage: Some indices mentioned in the results (e.g., women's productive time utilization index) were not fully explained in the methods section.6. Limitations: There's no discussion of the limitations of the study or potential confounding factors that might affect the results.7. Writing Style: There are several grammatical errors and awkward phrasings that should be addressed. Some sentences are overly long and complex, making them difficult to follow.8. References: While several studies are cited, there's often little explanation of how the current findings relate to or differ from previous research. <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Provide a clear explanation of all statistical tests used and include measures of effect size where appropriate.2. Enhance data visualization by including additional graphs or charts.3. Deepen the discussion by exploring potential reasons for the observed changes and their implications.4. Consider restructuring the section with clearer subheadings and potentially separating Results	
--	---	--

Review Form 1.7

	<p>and Discussion.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">5. Ensure all indices and measures are fully explained in the Methods section.6. Include a discussion of study limitations and potential confounding factors.7. Conduct a thorough proofreading to improve grammar and clarity.8. Expand on comparisons with previous literature, explaining how this study confirms, contradicts, or extends previous findings. <p>CONCLUSION:</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The conclusion succinctly recapitulates the main findings of the study.2. It effectively highlights the multifaceted benefits of farm pond adoption, including improvements in various indices and income allocation patterns.3. The gender-empowering effects of farm ponds are specifically noted, which is an important aspect of the study. <p>Areas for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Implications: While the conclusion summarizes the findings, it doesn't sufficiently discuss their implications for policy, practice, or future research.2. Limitations: There is no mention of the study's limitations, which is an important component of a scientific conclusion.3. Future Research: The conclusion doesn't suggest any directions for future research based on the study's findings or limitations.4. Broader Context: The conclusion could benefit from placing the findings in a broader context of sustainable agriculture and climate change adaptation in drought-prone regions.5. Specificity: Some statements are quite general and could benefit from more specific details or examples from the study's findings.6. Structure: The conclusion is presented as one long paragraph, which can be difficult to follow. Breaking it into smaller paragraphs could improve readability.7. Recommendations: While the study seems to have clear implications for policy and practice, no specific recommendations are made in the conclusion. <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Include a brief discussion of the implications of these findings for policy makers, agricultural extension services, and farmers in drought-prone regions.2. Acknowledge any limitations of the study, such as sample size, geographical scope, or potential confounding factors.3. Suggest directions for future research that could build on or extend the findings of this study.4. Place the findings in the broader context of climate change adaptation and sustainable agriculture in drought-prone regions.5. Include some specific examples or statistics from the study's findings to support the general statements made in the conclusion.6. Restructure the conclusion into smaller paragraphs for improved readability. Consider using subheadings if appropriate.7. Provide some specific recommendations based on the study's findings, particularly in relation to the extension interventions mentioned in the results section.8. Consider ending with a strong statement about the overall significance of the study and its contribution to the field.	
--	--	--

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Zakria Zaheen
Department, University & Country	Qingdao University, China