

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_95391
Title of the Manuscript:	A Study of Value Chain Map & Economics of Papaya in Karnataka State
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<p>This manuscript is good for published, but must be completed with conclusions. The suggested was about "banana", in my opinion is not correlate with this study on papaya. Put the suggest about cultivating or marketing process of this commodity.</p> <p>The title that enough for this study.</p> <p>Abstract is still not complete yet, due to without the conclusion and suggest of this study.</p> <p>Subsections and structure was full complete, but explanation every section very simple.</p> <p>Adding the explanation in section more detail to be scientifically manuscript.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	In the methodology was very good with the technical sampling method and number of sample, but in the result poor in the explanation every district with special location in problem itself. Giving the table to explains every district to look at potential and competitive as compered of them.	

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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bambang Surya Adji Syahputra
Department, University & Country	Panca Budi University, Indonesia