

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)	1. Yes. The manuscript meets the interests of the journal. The authors unravel the structure of the Papaya value chain, specifically in Karnataka State, identifying the main agents involved in the production and commercialization of such a product, their interactions and relative importance. 2. Yes, the title of the article is appropriate. 3. Yes. The summary is comprehensible and allows us to understand the objectives of the work, as well as the main results obtained. 4. Yes. Both the structure and the subsections have been conveniently chosen. 5. Yes. I did not identify methodological errors. 6. Yes. The main references were mentioned.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The writing could be improved. There are words with lowercase letters starting sentences. The use of comma is sometimes inappropriate. Figure numbering needs to be revised (sometimes it is written ``Figure .01"; at other times, Figure .1).	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Wilson Calmon Almeida dos Santos
Department, University & Country	Fluminense Federal University, Brazil