

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	A Systematic Review

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>

Review Form 3

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.	Improving water productivity in the context of climate change is crucial for the scientific community but it is not addressed the pressing challenges of water scarcity and food security in India. This systematic review is not well synthesizing existing research and highlights innovative strategies that can enhance water use efficiency, providing valuable insights for policymakers and researchers alike. If it identifying successful practices and areas for further investigation, the review contributes to a deeper understanding of sustainable water management, ultimately supporting efforts to mitigate climate change impacts and promote resilience in vulnerable ecosystems and communities.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Some modifications are needed. Therefore, the following title is suggested: Improving Water Productivity in the Context of Climate Change: A Systematic Review from an Indian Perspective	
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.	NO. An abstract for a systematic review should generally include these components: Background, Objectives, methods, results and conclusion	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No. The major components of a systematic review should include: Introduction: This section should provide background information and clearly state the objectives of the review. Materials and Methods: This part should describe the context of the study, particularly focusing on India, and outline the methods used for the review. Literature Review: A comprehensive review of existing literature relevant to the topic. Conclusion and Future Plan: This section should summarize the findings and propose directions for future research.	
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.	This manuscript should demonstrate scientific strength and technical soundness through its comprehensive approach to reviewing existing literature and synthesizing findings relevant to water productivity in the context of climate change. The inclusion of diverse methodologies and data sources enhances the credibility of the results, allowing for a well-rounded perspective on the challenges and opportunities in this field. Additionally, the manuscript effectively integrates current research trends with practical implications, making it a valuable resource for both researchers and policymakers. Overall, its thorough analysis and clear articulation of objectives contribute to its scientific validity.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Some references are outdated, especially regarding qualitative descriptions, and recent data is required due to changes in the field.	
Minor REVISION comments	To effectively communicate valuable understandings to the scientific community, the components and feedback provided should be taken into account.	
Is the 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:	Siraj Beshir Sheko
Department, University & Country	Madda Walabu University, Ethiopia