

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEAI_115751</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Energy Consumption Pattern in Irrigated Paddy Cultivation in Thiruvanamalai District of Tamil Nadu – A Case Study</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 1.7**

**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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Generally, further in-depth interpretation of the data is needed.</b></li> <li>2. <b>Basically suitable.</b></li> <li>3. <b>More comprehensive.</b></li> <li>4. <b>Unreasonable.</b></li> <li>5. <b>Basically correct.</b></li> <li>6. <b>Serious deficiency.</b></li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>Basically possible</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>(1) In the "INTRODUCTION" part of the manuscript, the current situation of the field and the research of related scholars are summarised as insufficient, and it is suggested to further increase the relevant content.</p> <p>(2) The author mentions in the second part that "he data were collected by making personal contact with the individual farmer." How was the reliability of the data verified, whether it was one farmer or one hundred farmers? Please describe in detail.</p> <p>(3) It is suggested that 2.1 and 2.1.1 be merged, or that the second part be combined as a whole, as 2.2 or 2.1.2 do not appear in the manuscript.</p> <p>(4) The authors are requested to consider carefully whether the addition of "%" is necessary for the calculation of Energy profitability in section 2.1.1.</p> <p>(5) The format is uniform, especially in section 3.1, where some initial paragraphs have blank lines and others do not.</p> <p>(6) Table2 does not appear in the text as a paraphrase of it, and the authors are asked to verify whether it is needed.</p> <p>(7) Why is the energy consumption of straw baling missing from Figure 1?</p> <p>(8) The manuscript is not well structured and lacks a "results" section.</p> <p>(9) The summary of energy consumption results for the entire rice production chain is not in-depth enough.</p> <p>In summary, authors are advised to make extensive, significant revisions to the manuscript.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<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>Qingqing Wang</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>China</b>