

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_100364
Title of the Manuscript:	A Comparative Economic Analysis of Cucumber and Bitter gourd Cultivation in Sultanpur district of Uttar Pradesh
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)	1. No. 2. Yes, it is. 3. It is good for author to include the introduction/background/problem statement as backdrop of discussion for the objectives. 4. Author should strengthen the problem statement and enrich the literature review. Besides, it is good for author to include the conclusion followed by the implications in the manuscript. 5. Yes. 6. It is good for author enrich the literature review, with that it may increase the number of reference lists.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	- It is good for author to send the paper for proofreading before the submission.	
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Winnie Wong Poh Ming
Department, University & Country	School of Business and Management, University of Technology Sarawak, Malaysia