

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_103463</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>An Economic Analysis of Cost, Returns and Profitability in Production of Cashew Nut in South Goa District of Goa</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### 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</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. The topic about cost, return and profitability is interested for the scientific community.</p> <p>2. The title is suitable, taking into consideration the structure of the manuscript.</p> <p>3. I find the abstract comprehensive.</p> <p>4. The subsections are appropriate for the topic of the paper.</p> <p>5. In my opinion the manuscript is scientifically correct, the descriptive analysis is well conducted, but, given that the Introduction is very similar or identical to other published research, the manuscript needs improvements in this section.</p> <p>6. I consider the references sufficient and quite recent.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes, The English used is suitable for scholarly communications. Only one exception: "heired human labour" should be "hired human labour".</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The Introduction section needs some improvements because in the original form, it is only a compilation form other articles.</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Maria - Daniela Bondoc</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Pitesti, Romania</b>