

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</a>
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 (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.	The authors in this review article has tried to established the growing demand of water as wll scarcity. Meanwhile, multivariate and growing sectors of water use clealy have established future prediction. I think this review article have some innovation forthe scientic community.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of this article is appropriate.	
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 section of the article is quite comprehensive. However, illustration of results including discussions need to concise highlighting the core finding areas rather than detail discussions.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	1. Introduction section need to rearrange and rewrite with more recent background scientific explorations.  Illustrated Materials and Methods sections are not so standard as a review article. The authors would be suggested to modify and rearrange this section with more clearly and informative presentation.	
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The number and volume of references are not sufficient. As of multi-sector illustrations in the review article, it would not include more literatures exploration.	
Minor REVISION comments	Minor revision	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shahidul Islam
Department, University & Country	University of Chittagong, Bangladesh