

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_86910
Title of the Manuscript:	Validation and feedback analysis of Agromet Advisory Services in Khammam district of Telangana under KVK, Wyr
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript needs English and typing correction. Some phrases require rewording to clarify the message. Abbreviations should be explained when they first appear in the text – such as “ASD” or “WAP”.</p> <p>In the chapter “Materials and methods”: -subchapter 2.1, “Quantitative verification methods”: the authors should explain in more detail the method they used; -subchapter 2.1.3 is missing.</p> <p>In the chapter “Results and Discussion”: -the order of presentation of the results should be the same as in the chapter "Material and methods": first the data of the quantitative evaluation, then those of the qualitative evaluation; -in subchapter 3.1.2: Table 2 is, actually, Table 1. Please correct; -Figure 3 has the same title as Figure 1. Please correct; -more discussions should be included based on the results obtained. The usefulness of the results obtained should be discussed and several comparisons with the results of other studies should be included.</p> <p>The “References” chapter should include more references. The authors should include references corresponding to the questionnaire they used (the questionnaire is probably published somewhere), as well as references corresponding to the scores used in the study.</p>	<p>We have corrected all types of correction</p> <p>We have abbreviated ASD and WAP where they first appeared in the text</p> <p>We have explained in detail verifications methods We have corrected 2.1.3 which was missing</p> <p>In results and discussion we have explained quantitative evaluation then after only qualitative evaluation</p> <p>We have corrected table numbers and figure name</p> <p>We have explained and included references wherever needed.</p> <p>We have added 6 more references and included wherever its requirement.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	--	-
Optional/General comments	--	-

[Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></u> YES Given that the study includes the presentation of the results of a questionnaire, the authors should state that they have obtained the prior informed consent of the study participants. Authors should also include the agreement of the Ethics Commission for the conduct of the study (document number).	Oral consent was taken and farmers participated voluntarily in this study