

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_93948
Title of the Manuscript:	Front Line Demonstrations – An effective of upscaling improved varieties of Onion impact on onion variety Agrifound Dark Red in Mahaboobnagr district of Telangana, India
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 the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

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

## Review Form 1.6

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVIEW comments	<p><b>Theme:</b> Original cut item. To be original means that there are no studies on the subject. In this case, there are some treatises as shown in the internal writing. It can be considered original due to the area in which this study is carried out.</p> <p><b>Summary:</b> The objective of the investigation is missing, the methodology reveals an important route of the investigation and the conclusions present an important contribution on this topic.</p> <p><b>Keywords:</b> Does not exist. It is suggested to work with the UNESCO THESAURI.</p> <p><b>Introduction:</b> The antecedent is very scarce for the determination of the topic; the justification is weak with little literature on the subject to work on. The objective is set out in an incomplete way, lacking the why? It is suggested to expand this information.</p> <p><b>Materials and methods:</b> The context of the investigation is pertinent; the selected population and the experiential design by plots are adjusted to the research requirement. The method for reading the statistical data is well established.</p> <p><b>Results and Discussion:</b> The results are compared with previous studies; This indicates that there is a study on the subject, this affects its originality. The future lines of research that can be given from this work are not indicated; Neither are the shortcomings generated in this process indicated, if they exist.</p> <p><b>Conclusions:</b> Apparently, the conclusions reveal important findings. However, since the objective is not clear, this contribution cannot be correctly visualized.</p> <p><b>Bibliographic references:</b> The references support a scientific article. It is suggested that they be at least between 30 – 50. However, the journal requirement must be taken into account.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVIEW comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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:	Jeverson Santiago Quishpe Gaibor
Department, University & Country	Salesian Polytechnic University, Ecuador