

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_98938
Title of the Manuscript:	Farmers' Perception on Tuber Crop Production Technology in Manipur
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes the manuscript is important for scientific community however, the authors need to be comprehensive <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The title of the article is suitable - The abstract of the article is not comprehensive enough. There is a need to include the methodology, how the data was analysed and provide the recommendation of the study - The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate but are brief - The manuscript is scientifically correct The references are sufficient and recent	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	- The grammar is poor	
Optional/General comments	Corrections to be done before the paper is accepted for publication In the methodology clearly state how the data was analyzed	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	George Omoto
Department, University & Country	KALRO, Kenya