

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_88246
Title of the Manuscript:	VALUE CHAIN OF SAFFLOWER –AN ANALYSIS AND IDENTIFICATION OF OPPORTUNITIES AHEAD
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>The research is good and suitable for publication, but it must:</p> <p>1- Describe the problem more broadly</p> <p>2- Drafting the original model in value chain analysis (if possible)</p> <p>3- Writing recommendations at the end of the research, while expanding on them through the research results</p> <p>4 - Explanation of why it is difficult to identify the composition of the crop by the farmers, as the researcher mentioned that the lack of knowledge of agriculture and their lack of information about the crop is the reason for the weak value added, so the reasons for this must be mentioned</p> <p>As for the research, it is valid for publication after making some of these minor required modifications</p>	<p>Problem was described more appropriately according to the suggestions. Recommendations were given based on the research results and mentioned in the article.</p> <p>It was not the lack of knowledge about the agriculture but it is the lack of knowledge about value addition and the reason for value addition is non-popularity about the value added products. These two aspects were clearly mentioned and corrected in the manuscript as per the suggestions.</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		Thoroughly verified again and minor mistakes were corrected.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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)
<u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u>	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	<u>No ethical issues were observed.</u>