

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_96567
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative assessment of farmer's brinjal variety in different agro-climatic conditions
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)	1. The introduction of the work brilliantly presents the importance of this work from an ecological, social and economic point of view. 2. The different conditions reported in the title are not detailed in the work. 3. Yes. 4. Yes. 5. There is a lack of information for the necessary validation of the hypothesis. 6. Yes.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. Yes.	
Optional/General comments	The introduction of the work brilliantly presents the importance of this work from an ecological, social and economic point of view. The main problem regarding the validation of the results is that the details of the different agroclimatic conditions that occurred in the 68 places where the tests were carried out are not presented. Without this clarification, the impression one has is that the tests took place in extremely uniform agroclimatic conditions during the monsoons. What unit is q/ha? Using International System of Units is required. Abbreviations must be expressed literally the first time they are presented in the text as they appear in Farmer participatory on-farm trials (FPOFTs) for example. Throughout the text this does not happen several times, for example: NIF, SEm, CD, CV%, etc. A scientist must select the statistical analysis that he considers most suitable for testing his hypothesis. The justification for adapting to standard protocols is not very consistent. The authors should describe the reasons that led them to choose the Least Significant Difference (LSD).	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Carlos Alberto Oliveira de Matos
Department, University & Country	Instituto de Ciências e Engenharia, São Paulo State University, Brasil