

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_103950
Title of the Manuscript:	A Study on Trend Analysis of Area, Production and Productivity of tomato in Uttar 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>)

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The shortcomings I saw in the article I evaluated and the recommendations I would make for the article were presented in the form of articles.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I'm not sure if the article complies with your journal's policy because your journal's content and policy are very different. 2. He did not specify which statistical program he used in the article. 3. tables are too large in the article v texts are too large 4. graphics may need to simplify data and text, or they may use abbreviations instead of years. 5. Some citations do not have references 6. references seem insufficient. 7. Graphics and references are given in the conclusion part, but they are not considered appropriate in the conclusion part. 8. The article contains important information for the region <p>Except for the case in point 1, the article can be edited and published, but I am not sure if it complies with your journal policy.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General 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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Veysi Akşahin
Department, University & Country	Turkey