

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_117610
Title of the Manuscript:	Socio-Economic analysis of cauliflower growers in Jammu region of Jammu and Kashmir (UT)
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>)

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><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript somehow provided scientific importance. Though a more comprehensive approach in dealing of the data sets could further improve this article. 2. Given the content the authors had provided, "Socio-economic-analysis" may not be the proper term. Data and analysis presented is more of a descriptive content rather than a proper Socio-economic analysis. 3. Abstract provides an observable lack of a more important data sets that could be found in the article's content. 4. The article provided a very basic descriptive approach that had showed a lacked of comprehensive scientific technicalities. Frequency as data is not substantial enough to merit a socio-economic analysis. Authors could had implemented a correlation and regression analysis to better describe the socio-economic profile of the area. Furthermore, provision of comprehensive discussion on how the data set had behaves could provide an overall snapshot of the agricultural situation of the area. I Highly recommend for the authors to consult statisticians whom had experiences on socio-economic profiling for the improvement of this article. 5. References were recent enough however no sufficient references provided in relation to data results that explains why such data behave as such. 	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 		
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</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:	Bryan Glomel S. Silverio
Department, University & Country	University of the Philippines – Los Banos, Philippines