

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_101424
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysing the scope of kitchen gardens in achieving dietary diversity and food security in rural households for resilient and sustainable food systems
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://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<p>This manuscript reports to identify the scope of kitchen gardens or nutrition gardens in rural households in Tamil Nadu in achieving dietary diversity and food security.</p> <p>The authors have, in my opinion, satisfactorily addressed the issues reflected in the title.</p> <p>Yes the abstract of the article comprehensive</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Needs more data in the tables</p> <p>Needs to include the references or additional references to highlight the scope of the study</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Improve the word bank that shows more scholarly touch in the manuscript.	
Optional/General comments		

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Asma Imran
Department, University & Country	Pakistan