

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Experimental Agriculture International |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JEAI_103634 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Estimation of Costs and Returns of Groundnut in Vizianagaram districts of Andhra Pradesh. |
| 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.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p> | <p>To some extent</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>yes</p> <p>To some extent</p> <p>To some extent</p> <p>It is better to use more recent references in the Introduction, Theoretical Framework and Empirical Review sections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The abstract is too long - Avoid mentioning numbers and figures in the abstract section as much as possible - The time domain is not provided in the abstract section - It is better to add Theoretical Framework and Empirical Review sections. - It is better to make a general edit before printing. - It should be noted contribution of this article - The conclusion section has no detailed explanation about the reason for accepting or rejecting the hypotheses. Also, no comparison has been made with the results of previous research mentioned in this research - Follow the general format of writing a scientific article - It is better to express the findings quantitatively - It is better to include the research results in a separate table | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | | |

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

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name: | Mahdi Filsaraei |
| Department, University & Country | Hakim Toos Higher Education institute, Iran |