

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_105166</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Analysis of Spatio-Temporal Behaviour of Arrivals and Prices in Major Onion Markets of India</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> )

### **PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	<b>1. I suggest the authors to include more cites of researchers in the field related to spatio-temporal effects on Onion markets around the world and comparing that research with their discussion performed in their study. I strongly recommend the review of different literature scientific research. Moreover, I think the authors must expand their introduction, discussion, and conclusion sections accordingly with new literature review that might strengthen their investigation.</b>  <b>2. Yes</b> <b>3. Yes</b> <b>4. Yes</b> <b>5. Yes</b> <b>6. Yes, although I suggest the authors to cite more articles to strengthen their findings.</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	None. I think the manuscript is well written and has not typo or redaction errors.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	I suggest the authors cite more articles related with the methodology they performed; and latter get a better understanding of the conclusions they found in their manuscript, discussing them with more details	

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Jorge Octavio Virues Delgadillo</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universidad Veracruzana, México</b>