

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_124001
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF CROP WATER REQUIREMENT ESTIMATION TECHNIQUES: APPROACHES, CHALLENGES, AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS
Type of the Article	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: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I went through all the manuscript contents. I was expecting something new from the title of the manuscript. The write up in “abstract” and “challenges and future directions” sections are vague and fruitless. A review manuscript should be comprehensive and providing something new instead summarising what are available in literatures.	Noted
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is a catchy, but not the details.	Done as suggested
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.	It is vague.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure of the manuscript is good.	Noted
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.	Not sound for publication	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are not enough and recent.	Noted
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Could be tolerable.	
Optional/General comments	. It may be reconsidered if rigorous amendments are made.	Okay

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>	