

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_112254
Title of the Manuscript:	Perceived barriers to the resilience building by the farmers in flood prone areas of Assam
Type of the Article	

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. This manuscript is important to gain insights that can be applied directly to society. However, if we talk in a scientific (or academic) context, this manuscript does not have a strong context yet. On an international journal scale, this manuscript does not have complete scientific data yet and still too shallow.</p> <p>2. It is suitable.</p> <p>3. It is indeed comprehensive but it's lacking correct grammar and punctuation. International reader may find it hard to read and understand.</p> <p>4. The manuscript's structure is appropriate.</p> <p>5. It is actually hard to say. The structure is scientifically correct, but overall, the manuscript is still has a lot of room to improve and deepen.</p> <p>6. The references is not sufficient and it's not even recent (1999, 1991, 1977). Please provide references from at least the last 5-10 years (2014 and up).</p> <p>Additional comments:</p> <p>1. Supporting data, such as previous research, is still inadequate.</p> <p>2. "The concept of CSALT is new for the farming community..." What's new about it? The advantages of CSALT are still not widely mentioned so it is not yet possible to know the accuracy of the method used.</p> <p>3. The research results have not been explained in detail. Lack of previous research makes this research cannot be contrasted/compared with previous research findings.</p> <p>4. The conclusion does not contain a summary of the research and does not show research shortcomings.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>It is not. The author need to rewrite the manuscript as it is hard to read and understand. Besides of grammar problems, the punctuation also need to be revised.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript idea is interesting. However, the data is not deep and sufficient. The research methods is not explained deeply. Apart from that, the English writing needs to be improved.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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:	Amanda Putri Nahumury
Department, University & Country	Universitas Surabaya, Indonesia