

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_100381</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Ascertain The Farmers and Traders' Willingness to Participate in eNAM: Binary Logistic Regression Analysis</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. <b>Yes</b> The authors present his findings which supported real data. But, result &amp; discussion part should be modified well because it's not supported by findings of other scholars</p> <p>2. <b>Yes. But, abbreviation should be avoided.</b></p> <p>3. <b>Partially. The authors didn't present the result well, no recommendation &amp; future work line</b></p> <p>4. <b>yes</b></p> <p>5. <b>Yes. But, components like research question, hypothesis test and objective should be added.</b></p> <p>6. <b>Partially. Result part was not supported with references at all.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	There were some grammatical error which needs further modifications	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	The author should take all comments and incorporate to improve the quality his work especially highlighted parts.	

### 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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Garome Shifaraw Geneti</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Mattu University, Ethiopia</b>