

Revision Form 3

Name of the journal:	Journal of International Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript number:	Ms_JEAI_125339
Manuscript title:	Impacts of Climate Change on Agricultural Systems: Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies – A Review
Article type	Review Article

General guidelines for the peer review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected solely on the basis of '**lack of novelty**', as long as the manuscript is scientifically sound and technically sound. For full guidelines for the peer review process, reviewers should visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies on 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>

Revision Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Required REVIEW</u> Comments	Reviewer's comment	Author feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight this part in the manuscript. It is mandatory for authors to write their feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences about the importance of this manuscript to the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Article that presents very valuable concepts and relationships. Concepts addressed of extreme relevance to the theme for today. Relevant objectives, but it is necessary to review the number of objectives indicated since it is not possible to achieve them all.	
Is the title of the article appropriate? (If not, suggest an alternative title)	Only Impacts of Climate Change on Agricultural Systems: Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest adding (or deleting) some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The summary is comprehensive, but there is a lack of an organization making its objectives and results more explicit.	
Are the subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	A subsection explaining the methodological design is missing.	
Please write a few sentences about the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Necessary to verify the objectives of the article, I verified the indication of at least 06 objectives, of which throughout the article one or two are possible to identify that it was worked on, but without the methodological design it is difficult to understand how to achieve this objective. There are many parts of the text that are lacking in reference or better organization of the presentation of the reference. A lot of data is provided that does not indicate where it was taken from.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions for additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are not enough, more or better indication of references is needed.	
<u>Minor REVIEW</u> Comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article adequate for scholarly communications?	Suitable language.	
<u>Optional/General Comments</u>	The term climate change appears in the title and in the keywords, it could use terms closer to what is indicated such as carbon sequestration, perhaps carbon neutral.	

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:	Henrique Rossi Otto
Department, University & Country	Estacio de Sa, Brazil