

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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The relevance of this manuscript is good .To undertake an impact study we need to see data from different years which is really appreciated and seen by the researcher .</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract needs modification;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initially it lacks introduction, • The gap that this study wants to fill is not clearly stated • The objective of the study and the methodology used is not clearly stated E.g How do you select your study villages amongst the other villages in the district??? clearly show the sampling technique • No conclusion and It doesn't include the recommendations based on the finding ; for the readers or anyone in need of reading the paper/further information 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is somewhat good but it miss some sections like clear methodology, Objective, clear focus area and recommendation 	

<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The manuscript is new – thus not previously published • There is no plagiarism and ethically correct • Some grammatical error is also found <p>But Results are not well written, i.e., it should have a fluent narrative, have no good graphics, Lacks suitable interpretation</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The references are sufficient 	
<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Somewhat good</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to see your methodologies in detail in the abstract part and in the body of the study • Clearly state the gap that forced the researcher to undertake this research • Its better if you add your conclusion and recommendation's based on your findings • The research is done before 5 years so how do you see the timeliness of the paper? through time different conditions may influence this finding because of time variation • Had no enough graphics to attract the readers and try to focus on the impact of your intervention and test the multicollinearity effect among different independent variables 	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tigist Kefale Mekonen
Department, University & Country	Debre Markos University, Ethiopia