SCIENCEDOMAIN international www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_56415
Title of the Manuscript:	GLOBAL WARMING - CAUSES, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION STRATEGIES IN AGRICULTURE
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed highlight that part in the manu his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The topic of this manuscript relevant but not quite new to readers. It is not an original research article as the author has presented the secondary data and research methods not mentioned. The current applications, ideas, and hypotheses are adequately accounted for but there lacks recent works (data). The authors have interpreted and presented the relevant results correctly however, recent and critical references that are missing. Most of an article's references should be to primary research from the past 2–5 years. The figure no 4 could be better presented. Rest of the figures and tables are appropriately presented.	
Minor REVISION comments	The author needs to correct some minor grammatical and punctuation error which were highlighted in the manuscript. Citations are needed in some places which were indicated in the manuscript. I kindly request the author to present a critical discussion, not just a descriptive summary of the topic.	
Optional/General comments	This is a review article. So it should give an overview of current thinking on the theme. Start with an overview of the topic and give some context, explaining why a review of the topic is necessary. Some new conclusions can be presented by analyzing previous works.	

PART 2:

		Author's comment (if agreed wi that part in the manuscript. It is m feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Milan Kharel
Department, University & Country	Tribhuvan University, Nepal

ed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and nuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write

with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight mandatory that authors should write his/her