

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_125749
Title of the Manuscript:	ADOPTION OF DRIP IRRIGATION TECHNOLOGY AMONG THE TAPIOCA FARMERS IN THURAIYUR TALUK, TIRUCHIRAPPALLI
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>

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.	This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it provides valuable insights into the adoption and utilization of drip irrigation technology among tapioca farmers in a region facing water scarcity. By focusing on the practical challenges and benefits of drip irrigation, it contributes to the ongoing discourse on sustainable agriculture, particularly in water-stressed areas. The study's detailed analysis of farmer profiles and technology adoption rates offers critical data that can inform policymakers and agricultural extension programs. I appreciate how the manuscript bridges the gap between policy recommendations and ground-level realities, though further emphasis on solutions to technical knowledge gaps could enhance its impact.	Noted
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<b>Change TO :</b> Assessing the Adoption and Utilization of Drip Irrigation Technology Among Tapioca Farmers in Thuraiyur Taluk, Tiruchirappalli District.	Correction amended
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 is well-structured and comprehensive, covering the study's key aspects such as its aims, design, methodology, results, and conclusions. However, a few suggestions could improve its clarity and impact: 1. Clarification of methodology: You might want to briefly mention why an ex-post-facto design was chosen, to highlight the rationale for this approach. 2. Specific results: Including a few more specific statistical figures from the results (e.g., levels of adoption, percentages of key practices like fertigation) would provide more clarity to readers regarding adoption rates. 3. Highlight policy implications: The abstract could benefit from emphasizing how the findings will directly inform policy changes or extension programs.	Corrected
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate and logically organized. The manuscript follows a clear academic format, with distinct sections for Introduction, Methodology, Results and Discussion, and Conclusion, which is standard for research studies.	ok

Review Form 3

<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound because it employs a well-established ex-post-facto research design, which is appropriate for studying the adoption of technologies that have already been implemented, such as drip irrigation. The use of stratified random sampling ensures a representative sample of farmers from diverse socio-economic backgrounds, enhancing the validity of the findings. The analysis uses descriptive statistics, such as mean, percentage, and frequency distribution, which are suitable for understanding adoption levels and utilization patterns. Additionally, the study grounds its findings in previous research, referencing relevant studies, making the conclusions well-supported and reflective of real-world agricultural challenges.</p>	<p>Noted and effected</p>
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>:</p>	<p>The references cited in the manuscript appear sufficient and relevant to the topic, but there are a few areas where updating or adding recent references could enhance the study's credibility and relevance.</p> <div><div><input type="checkbox"/> Government Policies and Schemes: Since the study references Indian government schemes like PMKSY, it would be helpful to include more recent data or reports on the implementation and impact of these schemes:</div><div><ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Ministry of Agriculture &amp; Farmers Welfare (2022). "Progress Report on Pradhan Mantri Krishi Sinchayee Yojana (PMKSY)."</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Tapioca Cultivation and Technology Adoption: Additional references on the cultivation of tapioca and technology adoption in agriculture, especially from regions with similar climatic conditions, would strengthen the discussion:</li><li>Reddy, M., et al. (2021). "Impact of Modern Irrigation Techniques on Root and Tuber Crops." <i>Journal of Root Crops</i>.</li></ul></div></div>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The manuscript is well-written, but a final proofreading round would further enhance its readability and professional tone.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer’s comment</p>	<p>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)</p>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	