

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_101765
Title of the Manuscript:	An Economic analysis of production of rainfed and irrigated maize in Ariyalur district of Tamil Nadu in 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>)

Review Form 1.7

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes, it is important</p> <p>2. I do not have problem with the title. The title can be good representative name.</p> <p>3. No, the abstract lacks its objective and method of analysis. The abstract should explain shortly the objective of the article and its method of analysis.</p> <p>4. They are more or less fine</p> <p>5. It is correct but very piece of reality</p> <p>6. No, more references are required. The citation within the text body is a bit strange. The following citation of Navadkar et al., and Suhashini et al., excludes the year of publication. This kind of citation is not common and popular. In addition, there are only 3 references on the introduction part. The lists of preferences is not in a proper way. This section has to be seriously revised</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>I think, the quality of language is fine. I did not find a major problem on this case.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The author should tell us what kind of method for analysis is applied and why that method is appropriate for this analysis. She or he has to explain why his or her method is most appropriate than other methods</p> <p>The author should also work on the refence section either within the body text or in the lists of 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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Muuz Hadush
Department, University & Country	Mekelle University, Ethiopia