

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_99850
Title of the Manuscript:	Basmati rice exports from India: Towards global food security
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community. Because the researcher systematically presents the Export of Basmati rice from India from the year 1980-81 to 2021-22. The author used the appropriate tools like CAGR and Instability with structural break. The manuscript concluded that Government has to give more importance on research and development and also adopt a stable policy on export to support producers of Basmati Rice.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract of article is comprehensive</p> <p>4. The Researcher has to write the Need of the Study and Objectives of the Study separately.</p> <p>5. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references given by the researcher are sufficient, but not shown under separate heading.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The author has to write the 'Source' under the Fig.1</p> <p>The author has to write the Heading for the Table 1</p> <p>The author has to write the 'Source' under the Table.1</p> <p>The author of the manuscript can write the materials and methods under separate headings like sources of data, period of the study, tools used, etc.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nagamani K N
Department, University & Country	Government First Grade College, India