

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | International Journal of Environment and Climate Change                                       |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_IJECC_95335  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Constraints perceived by the Rural youth in adoption of ARYA interventions in Telangana State |
| 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) |
|---|---|---|
| <p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?<br/>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable?<br/>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I consider the paper relevant to the scientific community in the area of knowledge to which it is directed.</li> <li>2. The title is succinct and appropriate.</li> <li>3. The abstract meets the expectation of the paper.</li> <li>4. The subsections explain the description of the paper well.</li> <li>5. The proposal of the paper is interesting for the proposed area of study.</li> <li>6. Bibliographic references could be more current and could be more comprehensive with regard to theoretical foundation</li> </ol> |   |
| <p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>  | The language meets the expectation/ It is worth reviewing some spelling points  |   |
| <p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>   |   |   |

### 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) |
|---|---|---|
| <p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p> | <p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> |   |

### Reviewer Details:

|                                  |                                   |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Name:                            | Dacyr Dante de Oliveira Gatto     |
| Department, University & Country | UniversidadeNove de Julho, Brazil |