

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_100126</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Pulse Productivity And Profitability as influenced by Cluster Front Line Demonstrations at Farmers Field in District Kupwara</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### 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> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. <b>The publication clearly indicates that the participation of scientists in farmers 'training brings measurable benefits to society, by increasing the yield of yield, increasing farmers' awareness and expanding their knowledge. The yields of cultivated legumes have clearly increased as a result of scientists. It is difficult to clearly indicate whether the manuscript is important, it certainly encourages scientists to conduct training for farmers.</b></p> <p>2. <b>The title is hard to read</b></p> <p>3. Yes, the summary is comprehensive. Minor corrections in the text.</p> <p>4. <b>Appears to be correct. However, the tables should be neater, the author did not give a description under the tables. Plants appear in the text: Rajmash, Greengram, Moong ? Were you growing three crops or two? The author did not include the Latin names of plants?</b></p> <p>5. The manuscript is clearly written, but there are shortcomings: there are no statistics.</p> <p>6. <b>Major gaps in the literature. Publications included in the bibliography are not quoted in the text. In my opinion, out of 17 items, there are no 8 cited in the work. There is no description for the tables, in table 3 the year was inserted unnecessarily</b></p> <p>The work qualifies more as a report and material for further action. I believe that a lot of work has been put in, even just training farmers and working on crops.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> 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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Małgorzata Skwierawska</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Warmia and Mazury, Poland</b>