

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)
<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>Yes</p> <p>No. Substitute behaviour with knowledge or another word because the research is not about behaviour</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The research area is good for scientific investigation but how the research was done is problematic</p> <p>There is need to beef up the number of references</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, where necessary, I have made some comments</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The introduction is too long and some of the content can be removed. Secondly, there is no need to describe the district under methodology. There is need to give some details about the interview schedule. What aspects did it cover for example? The results and discussion section also needs reworking. It is just a narrative without any deep analysis of issues. The type of the study should also be clearly indicated. Was it qualitative etc</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:	Masauko Msiska
Department, University & Country	Kamuzu University of Health Sciences, Malawi