

Review Form 1.8

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_120176
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Drought on Livelihood of Agriculture Farmers of Western Districts of Odisha in Drought versus Non-Drought Years
Type of the Article	Research paper

Review Form 1.8

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Is the manuscript important for scientific community? <i>(Please write few sentences regarding this manuscript to justify your answer)</i>	The manuscript is important for the scientific community as it provides critical insights into the socio-economic impacts of drought on farmers in Western Odisha, highlighting the need for improved irrigation and alternative livelihood sources to mitigate distress.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is mostly clear, but it can be slightly refined for conciseness and readability like, "Impact of Drought on the Livelihoods of Farmers in Western Odisha: A Comparison Between Drought and Non-Drought Years". The author can restructure the same types of titles for this while retaining the original meaning.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	The abstract is comprehensive but can be refined for clarity and conciseness. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Combine related sentences to reduce length. Specify the types of impacts (e.g., "financial, social, and emotional") early on. Clarify the methodology briefly but precisely. Correct the grammar mistakes. By following these suggestions, the abstract can be made more effective and reader-friendly.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript appear appropriate, but there are some suggestions for improvement: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Title: As per suggested above Abstract: As per suggested above Introduction: The introduction is thorough and sets the context well. Ensure the flow is smooth and the objectives are clearly stated. Materials and Methods: This section is well-detailed but can be more concise. Describe the study area, sampling method, data collection, and analysis in a structured manner. Results and Discussion: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Present results with clear subheadings for different aspects (e.g., economic impact, social impact). The author should add the statistical analysis for enhance the quality of the manuscript. Discuss findings in comparison with existing literature to highlight their significance. Conclusion: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Summarize key findings and their implications. Suggest practical recommendations based on the study results. 	
Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? <i>(Please write few sentences regarding this manuscript to justify your answer)</i>	Based on the information provided in the manuscript, here are suggestions for the author: Ensure definitions of key terms like "drought" are clearly stated. Improve the clarity and detail of methodology, use tables or graphs for clearer data presentation, add statistical analysis to enhance the quality of the manuscript and discuss study limitations to enhance the manuscript's scientific rigor and readability.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	The references provided appear relevant to the topic of the impacts of drought on agriculture in Odisha. However, to ensure the manuscript reflects the most recent advancements in the field, consider adding more recent references, and discuss results obtained particularly those published in the last 3-5 years. This will strengthen the scientific foundation and relevance of your study.	

Review Form 1.8

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the article should be assessed for scholarly communication standards. Ensure that the manuscript maintains a formal and clear academic tone throughout. Consider revising sentences for clarity and precision where necessary, and ensure all terminology and concepts are accurately conveyed. This will enhance readability and the overall quality of scholarly communication. The author should avoid the terms like he, his in the manuscript. Ensure the plural forms of terms in the statements like droughts, floods, farmers, etc. The major grammatical corrections are highlighted in the attached .pdf, refer to it for more clarification.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Overall, the manuscript demonstrates promise but requires revisions for clarity, accuracy, and consistency. While updating the manuscript the author can use the attached .pdf with line number and highlights for reference.</p> <p>Line 12 & 21: Replace 'stake holders' with 'stakeholders' and 'bee keepers' with 'beekeepers'</p> <p>Line 23: Keywords should be in alphabetical order.</p> <p>Line 37-40: The author should include the references for the statistical figures.</p> <p>Lines 50 & 52: The author should spell out 'HYV' (High Yielding Variety) and 'GSDP' (Gross State Domestic Product) to enhance clarity.</p> <p>Line 56: The word '<i>monsoon</i>' should be italicized</p> <p>Line 93: The author should check the formula of 'mean score' and add references for the respective formulae (Suggested correction: "Mean Score" = "Total score obtained" / "Total No. of respondents")</p> <p>Line 121: Replace 'he' with 'they'</p> <p>Line 137: Replace 'his' with 'their'</p> <p>Line 121: Replace farmer's with farmers'</p> <p>Line 156: Replace 'could not' with 'cannot'.</p> <p>The author should improve above suggested corrections.</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:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Pritam Prakash Patil</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Mahatma Phule Krishi Vidyapeeth, India</p>