

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_AJEE_117799
Title of the Manuscript:	Farming in the Age of Climate Change: A Brief Review
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajee.com/index.php/AJEE/editorial-policy>)

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> <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. The entire work seems to me like a literature review only and not a scientific research, lacking the basic components of a scientific paper</p> <p>2. Contemporary Farming and associated consequences of climate change</p> <p>3. NO, the abstract lacks the basic elements: work aim, objectives, methodology, analysis, result findings and conclusion</p> <p>4. structure is ok but content lacks vital sections such as methodology, results and findings</p> <p>5. Scientifically, the work is just a compilation of literature review and lacks scientific input. Although content is correct but not comprehensive</p> <p>7. Not sufficient but most are recent except 2002 and 2007 references</p> <p>The author can take the work beyond just literature review. He can analyse all the reviewed data or results using any acceptable scientific approach or methodology and draw his conclusions based on his own findings from analysis of the results. This will give the paper a more scientific look.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, but few paragraphs and sentences need to be re-cast or corrected . I have corrected some in the work highlighted in yellow and red</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The Abstract is purely a literature review and not an Abstract as it lacks elements such as aim, objectives, methodology, analysis, result/findings</p> <p>I cannot find any objectives, methodology or analysis of data or results to enable me re-write the abstract in acceptable format for the author</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:

Name:	Ugbah Paul Akeh
Department, University & Country	Nigeria