

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_100104</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>On farm evaluation of urd bean and mung bean for climate change adoption in Bundelkhand</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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> )

## Review Form 1.7

### 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. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>The paper entitled “<b>On farm evaluation of urd bean and mung bean for climate change adoption in Bundelkhand</b>” talks about a very important topic and is in line with the focus of the journal. This paper describes a study that was conducted in three villages in the Jhansi district of the Bundelkhand region during the Kharif season of 2021. The study aimed to improve the production potential of Urd bean and Mung bean crops through the use of improved technologies.</p> <p>Ten front line demonstrations (FLDs) were conducted on a total of 10 hectares of land, with the active participation of local farmers. The improved technology included the use of improved varieties (Virat for Mung bean and IPU 2-43 for Urd bean), the application of balanced fertilizers based on soil testing, and integrated weed, diseases, and insect pests management techniques.</p> <p>The results of the study showed that the use of improved technologies resulted in an average additional yield of 25 kg/ha for Urd bean and 165 kg/ha for Mung bean. The increased yield over the local check was 23.86% and 23.10% for the respective varieties. The study also recorded the mean extension gap, technology gap, and technology index for Urd bean and Mung bean crops.</p> <p>The study found that the average and maximum net returns were Rs. 1890 and Rs. 21910.63, respectively, and the cost-benefit ratio was 0.30 and 1.56 for FLDs of Urd bean and Mung bean, respectively, followed by local checks. Overall, the study suggests that the use of improved technologies can significantly increase crop yields and improve farmers' profits.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The title is suitable and clear</li> <li>2. The abstract is comprehensive, well structured, and well written.</li> <li>3. The paper is excellently structured according to the IMRAD method.</li> <li>4. References are sufficient and recent</li> <li>5. The conclusion is too poor regarding the interest of the work; the conclusion must be rewritten. Because the conclusion is intended to help the reader to understand why your research should matter to them after they have finished reading the paper. A conclusion is not merely a summary of your points or a re-statement of your research problem, but a synthesis of key points.</li> <li>6. Scientifically the manuscript is correct, and uses approved methods and tools.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p>	<p><b>Yes, it is suitable</b></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<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:	Atef Ahriz
Department, University & Country	Echahid Cheikh Larbi Tebessi University, Algeria