

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_96564
Title of the Manuscript:	Economic Assessment Sustainable Cotton Production in Maharashtra 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>The database that was the basis of the article is insufficient and irrelevant, a database for at least 5 years was needed. At the same time, these data should be presented in an appendix.</p> <p>At "Methodology" the comparative analysis of data should be developed theoretically.</p> <p>The article received either had missing pages or the numbering of sub-chapters is not correct, this oversight must be corrected.</p> <p>The title of the article is relevant and consistent with what is presented in the article.</p> <p>The abstract must be shorter and must contain the main points reached in the article.</p> <p>In the "Conclusions" part, it does not appear that what is provided in the title of the article was achieved, and this subchapter should be developed because it is rather short.</p> <p>The bibliographic references are few and not all can be found inside the article. If these bibliographical references were in greater number, surely the author/s could also have a "Literature review" sub-chapter.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	I am not qualified to comment on this.	
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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rus Mircea-Iosif
Department, University & Country	Nird Incd Urban, Romania