

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_85860
Title of the Manuscript:	Agromet Advisory Services for Climate Smart Agriculture
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.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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>ABSTRACT: this part doesn't present the summarized facts on the research in reference to the problem statement, and did not answer the following questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. What is the main research problem?2. What is the general and main objective of the research?3. What methods/approaches are used?4. What are the major findings <p>INTRODUCTION: the following are the major issues in the introduction:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. There is NO properly defined problem statement2. There is NO clearly stated justification3. There is NO research objective/research gap to be filled4. There is NO link on the AAS in this section5. Literature NOT duly cited and accorded <p>MATERIALS AND METHOD:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Method employed is NOT clearly stated2. Procedures employed in selecting the zones and districts are not clear3. It doesn't present scientific methods that could be employed or replicated elsewhere4. It is more or less listing already established networks BUT NOT how procedural protocols were employed and established <p>RESULTS and DISCUSSION</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. There is NO DATA collected2. It is just an outline of services AAS offers3. Discussions are just quotes from literature without any data support and link to the research4. Most information presented are not relevant to the research5. No research question/objective and therefore discussions have no reference <p>CONCLUSION: Conclusion should be done in reference to the research topic and objective</p>	<p>Revision made accordingly</p> <p>Amended revision</p> <p>Corrected</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Revision amended</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	This research article needs serious major revision (>5-7) for it to be considered for another review and correction	Noted

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	