

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_125167
Title of the Manuscript:	Enhancing Water Productivity under Climate Change Scenarios: Indian Perspective
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	In my opinion, this is important for the scientific community, as introducing how to improve water productivity under climate scenarios, which is essential for sustainable agriculture, particularly in the face of increasing water scarcity and climate change. However, this is not clearly articulated in both the introduction and methodology sections. I observed that the manuscript relies on outdated and inconsistent literature, and it lacks a clear description of the methods used to achieve the objective outlined in the title. It appears to be more of a review on the different types of water productivity, such as economic water productivity and crop water productivity, which are mentioned in method section. However, the authors should specify and implement at least one of these approaches to demonstrate how to enhance water productivity. Instead of merely mentioning them, they should explore the many recent and comprehensive methods, including new technologies, that have been published for improving water productivity.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It seems somewhat unsuitable because the authors have not demonstrated any practical efforts to improve water productivity, nor have they included any climate scenarios that should be considered for climate change. There is also no crop modeling or statistical modeling that integrates various water productivity assessments and explores improvements under potential climate scenarios. Based on the content, I would suggest a more fitting title: "Enhancing Water Productivity in the Indian Context: A Review."	
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.	In my opinion, the abstract lacks comprehensiveness. When looking at the abstract, it seems to only introduce the concept of water productivity (WP). However, based on the title, the objective should focus on improving water productivity under environmental factors, such as projected climate conditions. Therefore, the abstract should also include the most effective methods for enhancing different types of WP (crop, economic, etc.) during the assessment, which could serve as benchmarks to improve WP under climate change.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	I would say it is appropriate but could benefit with some refinement in terms of coherence and consistency. It would be clearer for the reader if the concept of water productivity (WP) is explained in the introduction. Additionally, the methodology section should focus solely on the assessment methods and approaches to improving WP in the Indian context, without including more literature reviews.	
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.	It is somewhat accurate, as the manuscript presents a literature review discussing water productivity (WP), its types, WP assessment, and ways to enhance it. Scientifically, it is robust; however, from a technical standpoint, it falls short because the authors have not implemented any existing or emerging technical methods for improving water productivity under climate change scenarios.	

Review Form 3

<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>:-</p>	<p>In my opinion, it is insufficient as it primarily serves as a literature review, presenting the findings of other researchers on water productivity across different states in India. Additionally, it does not incorporate the most recent publications, relying mostly on outdated sources. There are numerous recent studies available, and the authors should update their references by searching for more current research aligned with their objective.</p> <p>Reference links such as: https://data.apps.fao.org/catalog/organization/wapor , https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S136481521400228X , https://www.iwmi.cgiar.org/Publications/CABI_Publications/CA_CABI_Series/Water_Productivity/Unprotected/0851996698editorsoverview.pdf .</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>I think it is sufficient for scholarly communication, but it needs some language and writing refinement, and make coherence.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Overall, the title should be revised to better reflect the content of the manuscript and incorporate recent literature on water productivity assessment and the most effective methods for improving it. If the title remains unchanged, the authors need to demonstrate or implement specific methods for assessing and enhancing water productivity in line with the predefined types of water productivity under specified climate scenarios.</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Gizachew Kassa Agegn
Department, University & Country	Arba Minch University, Ethiopia