

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_116289
Title of the Manuscript:	CLIMATE CRISIS AND AGRICULTURAL RESPONSE: CLIMATE RESILIENT CROPS FOR SUSTAINABILITY IN FOOD PRODUCTION SYSTEMS
Type of the Article	Review 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.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/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)	1. Topic is relevant but the content doesn't do justice to it. The manuscript is vague in nature and while dealing with the topic, very few recent references are used though there is a huge volume of material available. 2. Yes. 3. It needs to be crisp and more focused around climate change and climate resilient crops. 4. Needs to be improved. 5. Needs modification (at one place, it mentions climate change leads to greenhouse gas emissions, which is just the opposite). 6. No, there are many recent references available which can be included.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Can be refined further.	
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anubha Das
Department, University & Country	India