

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEAI_121195</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Economic Analysis of Major Crops in Jammu division of Union Territory of Jammu and Kashmir</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

#### **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	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (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>Save for the topic, the manuscript is not of any importance to the scientific community because it is not clear at all. It fails to clearly state the study's knowledge gap, objectives, the methods, and the findings. One fails to make sense of the entire manuscript! I dislike the manuscript because of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It fails to state the study's knowledge gap,</li> <li>2. It fails to state the study's objectives,</li> <li>3. It fails to use proper methods of data analysis yet it talks of statistical significance and</li> <li>4. It fails to clearly indicate where the purported study findings were derived from.</li> </ol>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of the manuscript is suitable.</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>The abstract is poorly structured and it is not clear at all. It fails to clearly state the study's knowledge gap, objectives, the methods, and the findings. One to make sense of the abstract! I dislike the abstract because of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It fails to state the study's knowledge gap,</li> <li>2. It fails to state the study's objectives,</li> <li>3. It fails to state methods that were used to analyse data, and</li> </ol> <p>It fails to clearly state the study findings.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections of the manuscript are appropriate.</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>The manuscript is not scientific robust nor technically sound, at all. The author has not correctly stated the hypotheses they intended to test. Again, they have not Economic Analysis of Major Crops in Jammu division of Union Territory of Jammu. Proper economic analysis would require significance testing either using ANOVA, t-test, or regression analysis which is not done here.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Yes, the references are recent but not sufficient at all. Additionally, most of them are irrelevant as they do not relate with the topic.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language/English quality of the article is somewhat suitable for scholarly communications. This is the case because the author is fond of using capital letters on places where they should not have.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Generally, the manuscript is sub-standard.</p>	

### Review Form 3

#### **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>Fredrick Mangwaya Banda</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Lilongwe University of Agriculture and Natural Resources, Malawi</b>