

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_120331
Title of the Manuscript:	Enhancing Watermelon Yield and Economic Returns through Integrated Crop Management in Prakasam District, 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://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	It is useful in educating farmers to mitigate damage by using integrated management and achieving a good economic return, thereby reducing traditional practices, which improves the yield of the crop, which is used as a widespread fruit due to its nutritional benefits.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is suitable	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is comprehensive and does not require any addition	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The researcher used a sound scientific sequence, starting from the introduction and ending with the conclusions, all of which were scientifically methodologically appropriate to the justifications and objectives of the research, and the results were accurate and scientifically significant.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. =	References are sufficient and available, but there are two references that are present in the text and not in the reference list, in addition to a reference that is present in the reference list but not in the text. It is necessary to be precise.	
Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language is scientifically sound	
Optional/General comments	Please expand more on the definition of integrated management	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nada Hussein Al-Amer
Department, University & Country	Al-Furat University, Syria