

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_99705
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Growth Pattern and Immediate and Sustained Effects of Oilseeds Mission on Groundnut Production in Andhra Pradesh
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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	<p>Yes- The studies identified major technical constraints relating to adoption of improved technology, non-suitability of improved technology, and lack of technical guidance. Addressing these issues through policy and technological interventions are crucial for sustaining the productivity and increasing the production.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, but I think that the abstract contains too much information, I recommend more focused information.</p> <p>Yes, but I recommend writing about the topicality of the subject treated in the article, its importance and references from the specialized literature.</p> <p>Could be improved.</p> <p>There are too few bibliographical references.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
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:	Toderaşcu Carmen
Department, University & Country	Alexandru Ioan Cuza University, Romania