

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_96563
Title of the Manuscript:	An Economic Evolution of Organic and Conventional Cotton Cultivation in Maharashtra
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)
<p><b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>If it is supported with adequate background information and research gap (that necessitated this study) it can be considered important for the scientific community <b>The suggested title for the article has to be 'Economic Evaluation of Organic and Conventional Cotton Production in Maharashtra, India'</b></p> <p><b>The abstract lacks the following key aspects: the research gap is not indicated, no keywords are listed, recommendations are not provided, and it needs to be minimized i.e. 200 words</b></p> <p>Needs revision and there are missing sections: Description of the study area is missing; Dat type, sources and methods of data collection is missing; and sampling procedures and sample size determination is missing. Moreover, the sections are not numbered i.e. 1. Introduction 2. Research Methodology 3. Results and Discussions 4. Conclusions and Recommen</p> <p><b>They need serious revision: Introduction (no research gap is indicated, no objectives of the study and sources of information are given, and the background information is too shallow); Methodology (no source from where the formulas are adopted, sampling procedures and sample size determination are not indicated i.e. validity or representativeness of the sample is ambiguous)</b></p> <p>The references are <b>not</b> sufficient, and except one all the list of references are not used in the manuscript i.e. serious limitation of this manuscript.</p>	
<p><b>Minor REVISION</b> comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	The language is readable	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	There is a need to consider the scientific procedures to publish a manuscript in a journal. Critical elements/sections are missing from the manuscript and they need to be incorporated for publication.	

### 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ogeto Mohammed Aman</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Greenwich, Ethiopia</b>