

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_103017
Title of the Manuscript:	ADOPTION OF RECOMMENDED SUSTAINABLE FARMING PRACTICES IN TELANGANA STATE, INDIA
Type of the 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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	It is important as specified percentages of adoption processes by paddy farmers Yes! But it can be amended to Recommended Sustainable Farming Practice Adoption in Telangana State, India It is comprehensive by entailing content of the manuscript They are appropriate although lacking numbering It is, the way explanation I s given in the manuscript References are sufficient and cited in the manuscript content If author use the name percent let it be like that through-out that paragraph instead of mixing wit % sign. Citing et al., then follow year of that incidence, not et al, then year	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Improvement is needed if possible but in total, it is good	
Optional/General comments	Revisit your script to correct twice repeated words next to one another	

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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Makkies David Lengwati
Department, University & Country	South Africa