

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_126096
Title of the Manuscript:	Climate Smart Agriculture: Innovating Sustainable Practices for a Changing Climate
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

<u>Compulsory</u> 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.	1- Ensuring global food security and sustainability is crucial. 2- Prioritizing the reduction of food loss and waste is crucial. 3- Developing a more sustainable and equitable food system.	Highlighted the part which I added
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes suitable.	Yes suitable
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.	Yes.abstract of the article comprehensive	Yes abstract of the article comprehensive
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes.	
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.	No plagiarism found. It was compared to analogous items.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The resources are adequate and current.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	Yes
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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>	NO