

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEAI_101054</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Economic Analysis of Cost of Production and Profitability of Watermelon in Thiruvallur District of Tamil Nadu in India</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>This paper contains significant and new information, it justifies publication, after taking into consideration comments.</p> <p>The title effectively communicates the main aspects that will be covered in the article, namely the economic analysis, cost of production, and profitability of watermelon farming in a specific geographical region. It allows potential readers to understand the specific context and subject of the research.</p> <p>The abstract of the research article appears to cover several important aspects of the study.</p> <p>The paper is well-structured and clearly written only that the author's should improve the paper to comply with standards of academic writing. The paper clearly establish new research avenues, or implications for research and practice. This paper is interesting and contains useful contribution to the extant literature.</p> <p>The authors should use more of recent literature to support their arguments.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>I have performed a detailed review of the paper, and several suggestions are made.</p> <p>The author need to add further important aspects to the paper as well as literature. The design on which the paper is founded, is inadequate to fulfill the author's research hypotheses. The authors need to improve the discussion of result by citing some related papers to support the findings. The citation should be in line with the journal standard.</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abdullahi Bala Ado
Department, University & Country	Al-Qalam University, Nigeria