

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_126901
Title of the Manuscript:	Fodder Grasses and Irrigation Strategies: A Pathway to Fodder Sustainability in India
Type of the Article	Review 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>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <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 will contribute greatly in the improvement of ideas as it concern agriculture more especially in the irrigation sector	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable as there is no need for any changes	
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.	The abstract is appropriate except that there should not be any paragraphing	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Appropriately done	
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.	With the information provided shows that they authors did a great work	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes and appropriate	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Suitable and appropriate	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	A little adjustment should be made in the abstract	

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Obineche Christopher Ikechi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Federal College of Land Resources Technology, Nigeria</b>