

**Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_100379</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Impact of Front-Line Demonstration on Pulses Productivity and Profitability in Farmers Fields</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original research</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:

<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>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)</b>
<p><b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>The topic of the research is practical and contemporary</p> <p>The abstract is good, it represents the paper in its parts. Though needs proofreading [see suggestions]</p> <p>The introduction and background are appropriately clear and streamlined. Used some relevant references and updated to support the subject. However, add more references.</p> <p>The methodology representation is clear. Includes the model proposed and explains the work intended. However, suggestions are made in the data analysis.</p> <p>The results section is clear, with adequate data tables</p> <p>The discussion is adequate, clear, and streamlined. However, needs validation with the reported literature.</p> <p>The conclusion is adequate. Implications and recommendations are adequate</p> <p><b>Review carefully the write-up of the references for consistency, and completeness, and to match the journal's requirements. Add suggested references. Remove the extra references marked in RED here or add to the text!!!</b> Proofreading is needed [see suggestions]</p>	
<p><b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<p><b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments</p>		

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Hussin Jose Hejase</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Al Maaref University, Lebanon</b>