

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_120705</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Building Agricultural Resilience: Strategies for Climate Change Adaptation</b>
Type of the 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://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> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This is a very relevant article in the contemporary geopolitical landscape. This is because it addresses a critical issue of focus that are "Agriculture" and "Climate Change". For a growing (booming) population like India's these are critical issues.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	It seemed to me that the author was still writing the abstract since there's a hanging sentence at the end. However, at its current state it sufficiently gives an indication to what the article is all about.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, they are. I think it's only lacking the part that explains the methodologies.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript discusses scientifically tried and tested scientific methods for Climate Adaptation. The article is technically sound but necessarily scientific robust since it might be derived from secondary sources. In my opinion it needed a mix of primary and secondary sources to become more scientific robust.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	No, some refences stretch beyond the last 10 years and there are some insights that I think are worthy of intext citation.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The manuscript is informative and sheds light to agricultural resilience in form of climate change adaptation. I would however suggest addition of section that explains methodology to which the information presented was collected, and analysed.	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Bubelwa Lwanga Kamara</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Tanzania</b>