

Journal Name:	Journal of Global Agriculture and Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOGAE_12344
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Front Line Demonstrations on Productivity of Carrot in Tirap District of Arunachal Pradesh
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	1.Good article for extension services 2.The use indiscriminate use of abbreviations. 3.The quintal/ha should be changed to more common kg/ha.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<u>OK</u>	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	<u>Remove all & and other abbreviations. Check corrections on key words.The date of the field work need not to be stated.Its relatively old (6 years+)</u>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<u>OK</u>	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<u>Technically sound but the grammar needs more corrections</u>	

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	1 Add more current references 2.Do not use author initials in in-text citations. 3.Carefully go through the citations and references in accordance with the journals specifications.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	OK (Corrections effected)	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Henry Okolie
Department, University & Country	Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Nigeria