

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_92731
Title of the Manuscript:	Marketing of flowers cultivation under polyhouses in Chittor district of Andhra Pradesh
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>)

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>-The Title has been modified. Check the main text for changes in track changes.</p> <p>Abstract: -I humbly suggest that the authors reduce the wording for the abstract to fall within the threshold of 150-250 words. -The abstract should have a concluding sentence which states the significance or contribution of this study to existing body of knowledge and stakeholders briefly.</p> <p>Introduction: -For academic or scientific papers, this introduction is unacceptable.</p> <p>-Authors should have at least 4-6 paragraphs which highlights the definition of concepts like floriculture and other terms or marketing channels, research progress or gaps identified in other studies which is currently driving the current study's objectives, theories or ecological concepts which underlie this study, significance or importance of the study and clearly stating the study's main objectives or what the study seeks/attempts to address.</p> <p>Methodology: -Any description and justification of the study area? Why was that particular district selected for this study? -Authors need to number the equations in an orderly manner. I suggest authors use the equation insert tab to enter each equation. -Authors failed to state clearly the research strategy, sampling size, methodology and probabilistic sampling means of generating information from the target population. -How did authors arrive at the 30-sampling size? -How representative is this 30 or sampling size in drawing general conclusions for this study? -What technique was used in engaging them-random sampling, convenient, purposive, snowball and so on. Selection technique needs to be stated and justified accordingly.</p> <p>Results and discussion: -Check the numbering order for this section. 3.1? or the 1.1 means it is part of the introduction? Authors are advised to check and effect the needed corrections accordingly. -I did not see any thorough or tentative discussion where the results of this study were compared to existing studies or literature. -Does the current study agree or disagree with existing studies? What other factors or policies influence or drive the scope of this study?</p> <p>Conclusions: -The conclusion should not repeat the results stated in the results section directly. It should summarize them briefly. -The limitations of this study must be integrated briefly in the conclusion section. -Any possible areas or gaps that could guide or drive future studies/researchers? -The relevance of findings could also be integrated briefly in the concluding section.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>-Some moderate to major grammatical defects and syntax errors were identified. Authors need to check the manuscript thoroughly to correct such defects after revision.</p> <p>-Some renumbering/ordering needs to be effected.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	The manuscript is generally informative. The current state of the manuscript is far from being publishable. AUTHORS NEED TO INTEGRATE COMMENTS RAISED TO IMPROVE THE OVERALL NATURE OF THE MANUSCRIPT.	
----------------------------------	--	--

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:	Isaac Sarfo
Department, University & Country	Research Institute for History of Science and Technology, Nanjing University of Information Science and Technology, China