

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_103982
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Front Line Demonstrations on Mustard Productivity and Profitability in Shivpuri District of Madhya Pradesh, India
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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to have clearer writing on the current scenario on the Mustard Productivity and Profitability in Shivpuri District of Madhya Pradesh, India as the current problem needs to be identified clearly and the importance of Mustard Productivity and Profitability for India. • Add more current statistical data on the Mustard Productivity and Profitability in Shivpuri District of Madhya Pradesh, India over the last 5 years perhaps. • The past studies used are not critically reviewed and analysed for this study. • The methodological instrumental tools used were not clearly stated and also justified. • The results obtained were not clearly interpreted and discussed • Please relook. The results for "profitability" were not studied but it was stated in the title. • The conclusion is not very clear and also did not explain how the results could be used to narrow the current research gap identified earlier • Poor in-text citations and APA references format 	
<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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Chiam CC
Department, University & Country	Malaysia