

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_104952
Title of the Manuscript:	Risk attitude of farmers in climate extreme region of Andhra Pradesh
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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. This manuscript is important for the scientific community. First of all, it concerns the scientific issues of the development of agricultural insurance, the improvement of insurance culture and the development of new insurance products.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title of the article is appropriate.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. In general, the structure of the manuscript corresponds to the regulations for the design of scientific publications. Compliance of sections and information content is observed.</p> <p>5. Yes, this manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. Yes, the links are satisfactory. Also, I provide a link to an article that may be useful for the author: https://www.webofscience.com/wos/woscc/full-record/WOS:000425038100008?KeyUID=WOS:000425038100008&SID=EUW1ED0FC6ZIJCNuGhJPhl6vMcKr0</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Check and fix language errors	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Author guidelines must be followed	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Henrikh Hudz
Department, University & Country	Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine