

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_103487
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS OF TOMATO AND CUCUMBER IN QATAR AGRO CLIMATIC ZONE
Type of the Article	Review 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The world is facing tomato crisis. The researcher has dealt with a pertinent subject on tomato and cucumber in Qatar, which has an international implications. Thus, the manuscript is important for scientific community. 2. The title is fine, still it can be made catchy and fascinating one. Instead of 'Agricultural Economics' 'Agricultural marketing' can be used. 3. The abstract contains 159 words but without key words. The major findings of the research were not discussed. 4. Previous reviews should have been discussed. Even the major findings of the study should have be sequentially presented. 5. As it is almost a case study(Review article), it can be grouped under scientific paper. 6. Kindly follow APA style for citation (VII th Edition). 	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There is ample place to improve quality of the paper.	
Optional/General 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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	N. Samuel Babu
Department, University & Country	St. Joseph's Pg College, India