

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_103099
Title of the Manuscript:	"An Economic Analysis of Marketing and disposal pattern of Groundnut in Surguja district of Chhattisgarh, India"
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.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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes. Marketing of the final product place a very important role in present and future production decisions of farmers. Economic analysis of marketing will help in identifying the market efficiency across the marketing channels and in turn help in agricultural policy making.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, rewriting strongly recommended. Many grammatical errors.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, lack grammatical correctness in many places.</p> <p>References are not at all sufficient. None of the articles added in reference section are cited in the manuscript. And cited articles are missing in the reference. Reworking on references strongly recommended.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>English quality is not up to the mark. Can be improved.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Even though the results of the study are relevant and meaningful, paper can be revised for better English language so that this paper will be more suitable for scholarly communications. Rewriting is recommended especially for- Abstract, Conclusion and references.</p>	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Merlin Mathew
Department, University & Country	Vellore Institute of Technology, India