

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_109675
Title of the Manuscript:	Ranking of the constraints faced by the Khoya producers in production and marketing of khoya, in Almora district of Uttarakhand.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>- the manuscript is good and worth researching</p> <p>-The title of the article is suitable</p> <p>-The abstract is comprehensive. However the numerical statistics need to be provided to the key findings. For instance, "...The findings of the study revealed that in the production stage, the most significant challenges were a lack of knowledge concerning cattle disease symptoms (insert some statistics), insufficient storage facilities for khoya (insert some statistics),...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The manuscript is scientifically correct - References are sufficient - The researcher needs to bring out more clearly the gap that the research is filling especially in the introduction of the study. - Are there any inferential statistics that apply for this research? Means are very descriptive and thus may not be the most reliable for making scientific deductions 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is okay and suitable for scholarly communications</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is well written and the researcher should try to improve it based on the above reviewer comments</p> <p>The findings are well discussed in comparison with what is existing in literature</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:	Peter Kinyua Gachoki
Department, University & Country	Kirinyaga University, Kenya