

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_102069
Title of the Manuscript:	Effectiveness of Extension and Advisory Services provided by input dealers during COVID-19 pandemic.
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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The subject is very important for scientific community but the manuscript need more input than available now</p> <p>The title of the paper is suitable</p> <p>The abstract is not clearly organised, the style used is telegraphic with not needed subsections, finally the It isn't comprehensive</p> <p>The structure of the manuscript is very particular, it isn't a scientific paper structure</p> <p>the subject is very interesting but the manuscript as all isn't scientifically correct</p> <p>the references could be sufficient if the contain is adequately used by the author in the introduction and discussions parts of the document, but it is not the case (<i>there's any discussion's subsection</i>)</p> <p>My opinion is that the manuscript need to be reorganised and additional inputs are needed to be fully useful for the scientific community</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is suitable scientific communications</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The focus of the review is on climate change and the manuscript failed to be tied on the issue</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Madi Ali
Department, University & Country	National National Advanced School of Engineering, University of Maroua, Cameroon