

Review Form 1.7

No

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_103633
Title of the Manuscript:	Farmer's Satisfaction Towards PMFBY Scheme in Trichy District of Tamil Nadu
Type of the 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>)

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>No, but it could be (see below).</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes, except needs either a limitations section at the end of the Conclusions or at least a few sentences devoted to limitations.</p> <p>No, see below. Also, did not see a statistical sample power analysis.</p> <p>No, in the Intro, there were a number of declaratory statements w/o reference / citation: Par 1, sens 1-7, Par 2, sens 1-5, and Par 3 sens 1-3. The 4th sentence is non-sensical. Needs revision.</p> <p>The biggest problem w/ this manuscript is that it fails to establish why satisfaction is important to anything, for example, it has been shown (cite) the higher the satisfaction with a service, the more likely to stay w/ that service and have it in an emergency to cover them etc... .. Yes, the authors are looking at factors related to satisfaction. But that begs the question why it is important at all. It's insufficient just implying that it is, and it's also bad scholarship.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Also, the conclusion is a lot of platitudes but it also avoids the question of why is satisfaction important.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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:	Ralph J Johnson
Department, University & Country	USA