

ReviewForm3

JournalName:	<a href="#">JournalofScientificResearchandReports</a>
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_JSRR_126096
TitleoftheManuscript:	ClimateSmartAgriculture:InnovatingSustainablePracticesforaChangingClimate
TypeoftheArticle	ReviewArticle

GeneralguidelinesforthePeerReviewprocess:

Thisjournal'speerreviewpolicystatesthat **NO**manuscriptshouldberejectedonlyonthebasisof '**lackofNovelty**',providedthemanuscriptisscientificallyrobustandtechnicallysound.  
To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

ImportantPoliciesRegardingPeerReview

PeerreviewCommentsApprovalPolicy:<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

ReviewForm3

PART1:ReviewComments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISIONcomments	Reviewer'scomment	Author'sFeedback(Pleasecorrectthemanuscriptandhighlighthatpart inthemanuscript.Itismandatorythatauthorsshouldwritehis/herfeedback 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 Manuscript is relevant in current scenario. The manuscript is written in correct format and technically correct.	Okay
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable based on manuscript.	Noted
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.	Minimize the abstract. Write it within 250-300 words. Add 4-5 keywords.	Done as suggested
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Subsections and structure of this manuscript are appropriate.	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.	The manuscript is technically robust and technically sound.	Done
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient and correct form	Okay
Minor REVISION comments		Noted
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is suitable.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Bold out the points in Importance of climate smart agriculture.	

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)	