

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_105274
Title of the Manuscript:	Constraints faced by fruit nursery growers in District Kulgam.
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>)

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes. The manuscript is a bit too brief, but being an original work, the study would form a good background for reference, comparison and further studies.</p> <p>2. Title needs to be modified. Suggested title: Constraints faced by Fruit Nursery Growers in District Kulgam of Jammu and Kashmir, India</p> <p>3. Abstract: The abstract needs to be updated to include Please, include atleast, one or two of important recommendations of the study.</p> <p>4. Subsections and structure are not appropriate, but modifications have been suggested to assist the author to modify.</p> <p>5. Being an original work, it would form a good background for further studies and comparison.</p> <p>6. References are fairly recent, but not sufficient. I suggest atleast three(3) more references to be added.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, however, a few grammatical errors have been noted and corrected to assist the author in revising the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Reviewer's suggestions have been noted on the manuscript using the comment boxes. Author is strongly advised to make those changes suggested on the comment boxes to improve the manuscript.</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:	Inibehe George Ukpong
Department, University & Country	Federal Polytechnic, Nigeria