

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_104378</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Adopter categorization and level of adoption among protected cut flower growers</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original research</b>

### **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:

<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>The topic of the research is practical and contemporary</p> <p>The abstract is Adequate. Mentions the objective of this study, then methodology followed by sampling and sample size, then the results, and ending with implications. However, needs proofreading [see suggestions]</p> <p>Keywords are provided. Adequate</p> <p>The introduction and background are fair because these are not validated enough with references. That is, many concepts and figures need to be supported to be clearer and streamlined. Also, need to add the objectives and how is this paper divided!!</p> <p>The methodology representation is adequate and supported [see suggestions]</p> <p>The results are clear, with adequate data tables. Good to support the discussion.</p> <p>The discussion is adequate, clear, and streamlined. It is validated by the reported literature. However, citations are not reported adequately and this section needs good proofreading and editing [see suggestions in the attached Manuscript]</p> <p>The conclusion is adequate. Limitations are not reported??? Must add <b>Review carefully the write-up of the references for consistency, completeness, and to match the Journal requirements. Many citations are not reported in your list of ref. [marked in Red in the text] and there are references in this list that are not used in the text which is an unethical problem of inflation of references... You need to remove all or introduce to your text clearly!!</b></p> <p>Proofreading is needed [see suggestions]</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

### 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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hussin Jose Hejase
Department, University & Country	Al Maaref University, Lebanon