

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_103333
Title of the Manuscript:	FARMER'S BEHAVIOUR TOWARDS THE PROPAGATION OF OFF-SEASON CUCUMBER IN MOKOKCHUNG DISTRICT OF NAGALAND
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)
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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes. Beef up the literature review. No. Yes, the presentation of ideas beginning from the aim down to recommendation is fine. but still need to revisit the APA adherence from intro to results and discussion. Yes, though it is plain and simple since the research design is descriptive correlational. Very limited. Beef up literature by considering only studies completed over the last 5 years.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, but it is highly recommended to have the tool validated by experts.	
Optional/General 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dennis G. Caballes
Department, University & Country	Graduate Program School of Teacher, The National Teachers College, Philippines