

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ IJECC_96809
Title of the Manuscript:	An analysis of production, economic and social Performance of capsicum growers under protected cultivation
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.journalajahr.com/index.php/AJHR/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 manuscript is good because comparing cultivation in different condition of filed. Comparison between two methods including cost of operational for the cultivation in capsicum is needed to be scientific and suitable with the title.</p> <p>How many percentage increase in economic value capsicum growth under protected as compare to usual cultivation? (in this manuscript not yet about comparison in economic value)</p> <p>The title was suitable, but inside of manuscript not enough explanation about comparison two methods cultivation.</p> <p>The abstract without conclusions and suggestion Subsections and structure was incomplete without conclusions. In methodology the research, about sampling method unclear. The manuscript must be corrected to be scientifically, in abstract not complete, conclusion and suggestion, and sampling method must be added. References very little in this manuscript, and only a few with similar research, added more references with similar research</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Before published, must be complete whatever not enough in this manuscript.	

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