

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_101061
Title of the Manuscript:	An Economic Analysis of Cost of Production of Black Pepper in Wayanad District of Kerala in India
Type of the Article	Original Research 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	Yes	
1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	Yes	
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	Yes	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	1. Finally, author has selected 5 villages from one block. But, total sample size and sampling technique is not mentioned in the study.	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	2. How the farms' profits measured and given in the table 1 and 2. Whether in terms of Rs or land size?. It should be mentioned in the tables itself or create note under the table.	
6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	3. Sources of table is missing.	
(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	4. Subtitles are not numbered.	
	5. Policy recommendations are not given in the study.	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	T. Amose
Department, University & Country	Madurai Kamaraj University, India