

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_99190</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>An Economic Analysis of Wheat Cultivation under Sprinkler Irrigation in Southern Haryana</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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	Yes Yes Yes Yes  1. Imperfections in the description of methodology.  1. What is the sampling technique adopted to select 15 formers from each Village. 2. Given data is not seems to be primary data. It is visible as secondary data that have been scrutinized with economic terms like production, cost, return etc .. 3. Then, what the author has collected as primary data? 4. What is the purpose that author has approached the 120 farmers? 5. If the study based on primary data, the original data should be given as classified in terms of study areas to know the data variability. 6. What are research problems? 7. What are the suggestions raised by author? 8. Conclusion seems like findings of the study. It needs to rewrite as well structure. 9. Table .1 should be redraw which shows unclear report. It seems like that two tables are merged look s.no.1-17 and 18-23. 10. How did he author given aggregate report after collecting each 15 formers?. Is there any methodology adopted? 11. Source of table is missing. 12. The details given in Analytical tools are not a statistical tools. It is the way of calculator. Author has to rename the title.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>T. Amose</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Madurai Kamaraj University, India</b>