

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_100104
Title of the Manuscript:	On farm evaluation of urd bean and mung bean for climate change adoption in Bundelkhand
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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? 2. Is the title of the article suitable? 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. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The manuscripts concerns to front-line demonstrations, are a new concept aimed at demonstrating newly released varieties in farmer's fields in different agroclimatic regions and under different farming situations with improved practices, technologies, and management practices. A comparison of the productivity level between front-line demonstrations and local checks were presented. The article presents the need for farmers to be educated using a variety of methods in order to adopt improved production technologies</p> <p>Yes, the title is consistent with the subject presented</p> <p>Yes, the abstract brings in a comprehensive way what was presented in the article. All subsections presented are appropriate.</p> <p>Data in the article are of scientific value and carefully demonstrated and presented .</p> <p>The references are in accordance with the theme of the article.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Yes the English language is suitable for the readers. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p> <p>No 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Angélica Maria Penteado-Dias
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal de São Carlos, Brazil