

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_123798
Title of the Manuscript:	Constraints Perceived by Farmers towards Climate Change in Bundelkhand Region
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the 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

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Problem statement may require more recent citations to justify the gap which this researcher seeks to address	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the study is alright	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is too long, a reduction is suggested.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	A separation of results and discussion is suggested.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The problem statement is supported by little to zero recent scientific articles used in the manuscript. The methodology's selection of study area is unclear. No mention of tool used to run PCI There is insufficient evidence to support the research area's reasoning.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Kindly consider the use of more recent literature – 70% (5 years old) – 30% (old literature) – very critical for purposes of justifying your problem statement. Should include the DOI of the papers cited.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Nothing major with the language but suggest the paper be sent for proof reading.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 3

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:	Noluthabo Wawa
Department, University & Country	University of Fort Hare, South Africa