

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)
<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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes. The black pepper is very important in Wayanad in terms of production, trade and farmers' income. The cost benefit analysis is significant in policy making by the government agencies.</p> <p>2. Yes.</p> <p>3. Yes. But try to make it free of grammatical mistakes.</p> <p>4. Yes, but the numbering is not appropriate, there is no punctuation in subsection headings. The cost benefit analysis should be in more detail. There are some formatting problems, which I marked it in yellow. Please double check the formula of input output ratio.</p> <p>5. Yes.</p> <p>6. No, only 5 papers are referred, the details of the literature are insufficient.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Let the author to review the paper word by word, make it free of grammatical and spelling mistakes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The data analysis should be in more detail and depth.	

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:	Yan Yunxian
Department, University & Country	College of Economics and Management, Jilin Agricultural University, China