

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_105659</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>PRODUCTION, VALUE ADDITION AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP DEVELOPMENT OF WHITE GRAINED VARIETY FINGER MILLET KMR 340</b>
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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>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>
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Abstract needs to add the reasons for this study to be conducted and the summary of the results/ findings. The current abstract has not much of "point" needed in an abstract</li> <li>• The background of the study is not clear as to the "country" that this study represents etc. Most of the writing were basically very "general" and it is not written in a defined scope</li> <li>• The review of recent past studies were inadequate and not critically reviewed.</li> <li>• The details on the methodological part is not clear and well-justified</li> <li>• The findings need to be interpreted instead of merely reporting and lack of reasons for such findings</li> <li>• The need for conclusion for the study on how the results/ findings of this study can be used by various and relevant parties to mitigate the current research problem</li> <li>• Need to use proper referencing format and numbering, the use of the arrow symbol in the numbering etc. Ensure all the references in the content are in-line with the list of references</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>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>
<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>Chiam CC</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Malaysia</b>