

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_128781
Title of the Manuscript:	Climate-Resilient Rice Cultivation in India: Overcoming Challenges for Sustainable Food Security
Type of the Article	Method not stated (Maybe a review 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: 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>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is highly relevant for addressing issues in sustainable agriculture under the pressures of climate change. It provides valuable insights into climate-resilient agricultural practices (CRA), specifically focusing on rice cultivation—a staple food for millions in India. By integrating traditional knowledge and advanced technologies, the manuscript highlights innovative solutions for mitigating climate change impacts, enhancing food security, and promoting sustainable livelihoods. Its comprehensive analysis and recommendations serve as a crucial resource for policymakers, researchers, and practitioners striving to tackle the growing challenges of climate variability.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The topic is Suitable.	
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 effectively summarizes the manuscript's focus on the challenges and solutions for climate-resilient rice cultivation in India. However, it could benefit from additional emphasis on specific findings or outcomes from CRA practices, such as yield improvements or economic impacts, to provide a stronger overview of the study's contributions. It might also mention the policy recommendations to enhance adoption.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The lack of a methods section is a significant gap. Even for a review article, a clear explanation of how studies were selected, analyzed, and synthesized is essential for transparency and rigor. Some sections are overly descriptive without sufficient critical analysis (e.g., listing CRA practices without evaluating their effectiveness or adoption barriers in detail). A few claims, such as adoption barriers (e.g., financial constraints, lack of awareness), would benefit from empirical evidence or citations. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and recent, covering a range of sources related to climate-resilient agriculture.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Asides from a few grammatical and syntactical errors, the language is suitable for scholarly communication.	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript could benefit from a more structured conclusion, summarizing the key recommendations and implications for policy and practice. Providing actionable steps for implementing CRA practices and addressing barriers to adoption would make the manuscript more practical for stakeholders. 	

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:	Bright Oluwatomilola Olunusi
Department, University & Country	Cornell University, Nigeria