

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_100775
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Study on Production and Marketing of Poovan and Nendran Banana In Thiruvananthapuram District of Kerala
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><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>1. The research paper is interesting. The researcher should specify the statement of the problem and significance of the study in the introduction paragraph.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable for the study.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the research paper is well framed by the researcher. The researcher should follow the alphabetical order of keywords.</p> <p>4. The subsections are relevant and appropriate.</p> <p>5. Yes. The research paper is scientifically correct. The researcher used appropriate tool for analysing the data.</p> <p>6. The researcher should follow APA reference style. APA reference is missing in the article and include more reference.</p> <p>The researcher carried a commendable work with suitable objectives with relevant tools.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	English quality of the article need to be improve	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	Author guidelines must be followed	

### 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>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Sujith. T. S</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Amrita Vishwa Vidyapeetham, India</b>