

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_79629
Title of the Manuscript:	Mushrooms contribution to farm income and The Socio-economic conditions of mushrooms growers
Type of the Article	Original Research 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

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Abstract 2. Introduction 3. Literature Review 4. Methodology 5. Analysis and Discussion of findings 6. Conclusion 7. References	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The abstract is not logically presented by the author. Abstract must capture the objective of the study, methodology, main findings, main conclusion and implication, and recommendation. 2. The introduction must be revised to capture the background information, problem and questions, brief review of related studies, motivation and marginal contributions, objectives and significance of the study. 3. The author failed to present a comprehensive review of related literature. 4. The methods adopted by the author is not clearly justified based on theory and practice. The ratios used need to be justified by the author. Also, author need to present the sampling technique and justify the basis for selecting the sample used. 5. The analysis is too simple and the implications of the findings are not clearly stated. 6. Author should present the main findings, their theoretical and practical implications and recommendations, all in the conclusion part. 7. Author captured only two references in the list. For a research paper, this is not rationale. Author need to review more literature and cite as many studies as possible to make the study rich and complete. 	
Minor REVISION comments Language editing	Author should read carefully and correct some grammatical errors	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

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:	<i>Umar Muhammad Gummi</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Sokoto State University, Nigeria</i>