

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? (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. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. YES, because, Pulse has a significant role in human diet in order to ensure nutritional security. There is a need to augment the pulse production in India and the government is taking several steps to achieve it. In view of that, there is need to encourage researchers to present their findings, that will help policy makers to frame policies accordingly and there will be a cross learning among the researchers with same interest. 2. Authors and co-authors need to revisit the title of the article and reframe it. 3. Abstract seemed to be alright, if possible authors can mention which organisation conducted the research 4. Yes 5. Yes scientifically correct but they need to rectify the article as per the comments given in the manuscript 6. References are sufficient 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The authors need to revisit the article and make the sentences correct grammatically. There are some grammatical errors that need to be rectified for a journal like this. ITS ESSENTIAL.</p>	
<p>Optional/General 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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Santosh Kumar Samantaray
Department, University & Country	Odisha University of Agriculture & Technology, India