

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEAI_120912</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>CONSTRAINTS IN MARKETING OF MAIZE IN TELANGANA STATE</b>
Type of the Article	

#### **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**

<b>Compulsory</b> 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 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.	The manuscript is important given its contribution in the agricultural sector. The survival and growth of this sector significantly depends on the findings of studies of this nature. The study equally adopts the Garrett's Ranking technique which is value adding to other studies that simply identify constraints based on the responses from a majority of respondents.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<p>The title needs slight amendments</p> <p>The title lacks precision. The topic needed to contextualize the reader to know exactly where this applies. For example; the region, division or country can be added. This is vital as the journal has international view</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>The abstract is not comprehensive and not proportionately balanced</p> <p><b>Abstract:</b> The abstract is quite brief but not exhaustive. The objective mentions "key" constraints, giving the impression that some of the constraints were not included in the study as implied in the topic. Balance the abstract to give almost equal attention to; objective, methodology, findings, conclusion, recommendation(s).</p> <p><b>Keywords:</b> eliminate "prices" from keywords, rather included the area, town and country.</p>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<p>Not sufficient</p> <p>There is need to add area for review since a major contribution to the value of the findings collaborated with earlier studies. That unfortunately were never reviewed. Additionally, those referenced will be reviewed to improve the scientific justification of the study</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>The paper lack scientific robustness</p> <p><b>Introduction:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the first citation (IIMR, 2023-24) should be written in full and currently cited according to APC citation. Additionally, it should be referenced.</li> <li>- Abbreviations like; IIMR, DES, TSM should be written in full at first use.</li> <li>- The last sentence of the introduction is more of a recommendation.</li> </ul> <p><b>Material and Methods</b></p> <p><b>Garrett's Ranking technique;</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Garrett's Ranking Approach needs to be explained further and in detail.</li> <li>- Provide a scientific justification to the adoption of this Garrett's Ranking to this study by citing authors that have adopted same approach.</li> <li>- Rij is explained whereas its not clearly identified in the Ranking Formula</li> <li>- The limitations of the Garrett's Ranking Approach should be explained alongside the measures that were put in place to overcome them and obtain a more reliable outcome.</li> </ul> <p><b>Data source;</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cite the first sentence given that its factual</li> <li>- 9.78% being maize should be presented in context with other crops, to provide a reliable justification.</li> </ul>	

**Review Form 3**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The sampling method was not scientific though clear.</li> <li>- the population was not stated and we cannot attest if the sample is a good representation</li> </ul> <p><b>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The table should be briefly recapped and thereafter presented, before explanations follows.</li> <li>- Where the responses “perception” or “factual” there is need to clarify them as the method of validating perceptual findings is different from factual findings.</li> <li>- Findings make reference to aligning with Krishna et al. (2018) when in reality the study was not reviewed. This gives rise to need to Literature Review.</li> <li>- The third paragraph is more of a recommendation, not a challenge.</li> </ul> <p><b>SUMMARY</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The summary is appropriate</li> </ul> <p><b>CONCLUSION</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The conclusion is more of summary rather than conclusion.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p> <p>=</p>	<p><b>Irrelevant references added</b></p> <p><b>REFERENCES</b> Some of the references are irrelevant as they are not cited in the paper. The references include; number; 3, 5, 6,7</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Language is above average</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Enormous work still has to be done to match the manuscript up to scientific expectation.</p>	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer’s comment</b>	<b>Author’s comment</b> (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>Neba Noela Buwah</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Bamenda, Cameroon</b>