

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEAI_99876</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>ASSOCIATION BETWEEN INDEPENDENT VARIABLES WITH KNOWLEDGE OF RESPONDENTS TOWARDS IMPROVED BANANA CULTIVATION PRACTICES IN VAISHALI DISTRICT OF BIHAR</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> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1. It can be said that the article is important for the scientific community. 2. The title of the article should be revised. 3. The summary of the article is comprehensive enough. 4. Subsections and structure of the article are appropriate. 5. The article can be accepted as scientifically correct. 6. References are insufficient. Parentheses should be used while giving the numerical results of the study in the abstract section. Statements should be reviewed. More appropriate keywords should be chosen. While giving information about the subject in the introduction part, one should go from general to specific. In addition, the importance, scope and purpose of the subject should be emphasized. "The average productivity of fruits in India has increased from 10.72 million tonnes per hectare during 2001-2002 to 11.87 million tonnes per hectare during 2010-11" the values in the sentence (million tons) should be checked. The methodology section is insufficient. Although information was given about the study material, no information was given about the method used in the study. The conclusion section should be rewritten in detail to reflect all the results of the study. The places I painted yellow should be reviewed.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language/English quality of the article should be reviewed for scientific communication.	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Ismail Ukav</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Adiyaman University, Turkey</b>