

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_113849
Title of the Manuscript:	Understanding the Knowledge Level of Farmers towards Climate Smart Agricultural Technologies in Agro-Climatic Zones of Tamil Nadu
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"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript written by the author is already classified in the scientific category and is important to the scientific community. The article's title is appropriate It is necessary to add a short explanatory sentence to the abstract to make it easier for the reader to understand. as in the following sentence: 'Despite the various constraints faced by the farmers, climate change acts as the root cause of several other constraints'. The sentence at the beginning of this paragraph does not explain what obstacles farmers face, although the last sentence in this paragraph has been added. The suggestion is to move the explanation to the beginning of the paragraph. Background and objectives should be separated. The year of implementation written in the abstract must be as follows, for example 2022-2023. To conclude, you should only write the conclusion without making any suggestions. Some sub-chapters and text structures are not appropriate, such as the titles of sub-chapters. For example, Methodology is replaced by Materials and Methods, and Findings and Discussions are replaced by Results and Discussions. The CONSENT sub-chapter need not be included in the article. The manuscript is scientifically correct References must be added to this article and must be at least ten years old. <p>Additional comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> There has been no explanation in the methodology of what the percentage range is for these five categories: 'No knowledge' (1), 'Minimal knowledge' (2), 'Basic knowledge' (3), 'Adequate knowledge' (4) and 'Superior knowledge' (5) respectively. What kind of statistical analysis has been part of this research? (Add to the research methodology!) The results: Regarding the level of technological knowledge of farmers, explain and compare with references why the percentage of farmers who have basic knowledge of crop insurance is higher (70.00%), improved seed varieties (56.67%), use of biofertilizers and slow releasing nitrogenous fertilizers (56.67%), use of improved agricultural implements (56.67%) and crop diversification (50.00%). Meanwhile, most of the farmers had adequate knowledge on adoption of micro-irrigation measures (70.00%) and moisture conservation practices (60%), adoption of improved livestock breeds and use of smart house for livestock (60.00%), crop intensification (60.00%) and utilization of weather based agro-advisory services (50.00%). Each paragraph of the research results must be accompanied by an explanation, and also add a reference after the explanatory sentence. Conclusions: Conclusions are written clearly and concisely according to the research objectives. There is no need for an explanatory sentence at the beginning of the conclusion. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The quality of articles in English is suitable for scientific communication</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>-</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:	Cheppy Wati
Department, University & Country	Indonesia