

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_105197
Title of the Manuscript:	An analysis of constraints faced by Organic farmers in the Cauvery Delta Zone of Tamil Nadu
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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>This paper was very important for scientific community.</p> <p>The title of the article was really suitable.</p> <p>The abstract of the article was comprehensive enough.</p> <p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript were appropriate.</p> <p>I think the manuscript was scientifically correct.</p> <p>The references were sufficient and recent enough, however, recheck the year please. Venkat, V. (201 , July 15) ????</p> <p>Overall, this paper was perfect, however with very small revisions.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language/English quality of the article was suitable enough for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Overall, this paper was perfect, however with very small revisions.</p>	

[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:	Nikolaus Salo
Department, University & Country	Permadani Flores Foundation, Indonesia