

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_103403</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Analysis of Price Spread, Marketing Efficiency and Constraint Faced by Marigold Growers in Raipur District, Chhattisgarh</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</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:

(<https://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy> )

## Review Form 1.7

### 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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community</p> <p>No, I don't think so. Analysis of Marigold Growers' Price Spread, Marketing Efficacy, and Barriers towards..... in Raipur District, Chhattisgarh. <b>(there is no dependent variable)</b></p> <p>No, the abstract is not comprehensive.</p> <p>Subsections and structure of the manuscript are not appropriate</p> <p>I don't think so</p> <p>There isn't any references.</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>Language/English quality of the article is not suitable for scholarly communication</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The writer must correct :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The title</li> <li>2. The abstract</li> <li>3. The introduction</li> <li>4. The research methodology</li> <li>5. The conclusion part</li> <li>6. References</li> <li>7. Grammar</li> </ol>	

### 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:	Setiasih Dra
Department, University & Country	Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Bhakti, Indonesia