

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_119694
Title of the Manuscript:	Feasibility And Growth of Mustard Farming In Uttar Pradesh And Bundelkhand Region (U.P.)
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>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. Manuscript holds significant scientific merit as mustard farming holds an important role in the economic growth in the study region. 2. There seems a lack of thought in the article title. I would like to suggest an alternative title: "Feasibility And Economic Growth Rate of Mustard Farming In Uttar Pradesh (U.P.) And Bundelkhand Region" 3. Abstract is comprehensive enough. Though I suggest to spell out abbreviations i.e. CAGR, CACP Keywords are excessive. Just choose few most important keywords. Do not include in keywords already seen in article title. Suggested keywords: "Coefficient of variation, CACP, Cost concept, Mustard, Instability" 4. I suggest to tone down colors of the figures (Graphs) used, better choose neutral colors rather than the bright stark ones. Arrange tables in a way that it will not be break between page for ease of viewing data results. A whole table should fit a page for discussion. Data presented were substantial but was not discussed thoroughly and comprehensively. Discussion consists of descriptive information which could be accounted from the table and figures already. There were a lack of implication and comparison to previous similar studies/literatures. I suggest for revision specifically focusing on bulking up comprehensive discussions with implications to the region. 5. Yes. Findings presented has scientific merit and is correct though it lacks comprehensive values. 6. Partially. I suggest comprehensive comparison of current data findings from previous similar studies. Please find most recent literatures and discuss implications to the industry of the crop of interest.	<p>Title has been modified to enable the readers understand the actual content of the research paper</p> <p>CACP and CAGR has been written in full form in the abstract and it is used as abbreviated form in main text. Keywords has been modified as per suggestion</p> <p>Bright colours are changed.</p> <p>Table has been arranged as per the suggestions</p> <p>Authors have discussed results to explain the data presented in tables. it was done to state what data implies. It has been tried that data is discussed in very clear and crisp manner in order to keep the length of paper appropriate.</p> <p>Similar studies on the same crop in same study area has not been published. Hence, comparison with previous studies was not done.</p> <p>Authors have tried their best to discuss all the tables and analysis mentioned in the methodology of the paper.</p> <p>As mentioned, no studies have been performed in the same study area for the same crop. Hence, comparison with previous studies can't be done.</p>
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. Yes, the article's language and English quality are suitable enough for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	