

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_120912
Title of the Manuscript:	CONSTRAINTS IN MARKETING OF MAIZE IN TELANGANA STATE
Type of the Article	Household survey

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the 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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>Maize is an important crop in South Asia and many other countries in the world. Maize production is low in developing countries compared to developed countries because of many hindrances in production and post-harvest processes. One of the bottle necks is problem in marketing, and others storage, drying, processing etc. This draft identifies problems in various aspects of marketing of maize with intensity ranking. If the policy makers address the problems gradually, maize production may be enhanced in India and similar countries as well.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>Result is properly given, but survey period, area, sample size (Methodology) etc are missing. Also the conclusion and suggestion parts are lacking. Minor corrections are made in the Abstract of the text.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>It is a small survey. So many subsections seem to be unnecessary. Structurally is almost ok. Minor corrections/suggestions are given in the text.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>Although the findings appear to be useful to policy makers and others, there are many weaknesses in the manuscript, such as, objectives are not clear, problems and justifications are missing, survey period is not mentioned, questionnaire was open or closed type is not clear, discussion on findings/constraints and review is very low, etc. In addition, summary is too short. It is missing short Methodology and suggestions. Conclusion lacks suggestions to counter the constraints, etc.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Only two citations are listed in the References. Two other citations are not listed under the References. Discussion and review in the findings is very poor/low.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, language quality is good. Only in some cases, it is written in present tense also in the findings. That is corrected or to be corrected.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Writing is short and sweet, but misses some necessary parts. It should be improved as corrected and suggested in the text.</p>	

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:	Gopal Bahadur K.C.
Department, University & Country	Tribhuvan University, Nepal Academy of Science and Technology (NAST), Nepal