

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_120265
Title of the Manuscript:	Job satisfaction level among the tea garden workers in Biswanath district of Assam
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it provides a comprehensive analysis of job satisfaction and socio-economic conditions among tea garden workers, a relatively under-research demographic. By highlighting the critical areas of dissatisfaction such as work safety, wages, and superior behavior, the study offers valuable insights for policymakers and industry leaders aiming to improve labor conditions. The detailed socio-economic profile, including gender disparities, adds depth to our understanding of the workforce's challenges, making it a valuable resource for future research and interventions. The thorough approach of the manuscript and its potential to drive positive change in the tea industry is commendable.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The current title is clear and descriptive, but it could be enhanced by including a reference to the socio-economic analysis, as the paper also emphasizes socio-economic conditions and gender disparities in the discussion. Adding these elements to the title will better reflect the comprehensive scope of the study and attract a wider audience interested in both job satisfaction and socio-economic factors.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract summarizes key points. But to make it more reader-friendly, you may write it in paragraph form removing subheadings such as the aims, study design, and so on. Also, much better if you have recommendations.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>I believe it would be beneficial to add the recommendations to the abstract. Additionally, the correct term should be "Materials and Methods," not "Material and Methods."</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound due to its comprehensive methodology, including the use of a semi-structured schedule (which I believe is a questionnaire, if yes please use the word questionnaire instead of schedule) and quantitative analysis through frequency and percentage tables. The study's focus on multiple aspects of job satisfaction, such as wages, working conditions, and safety, ensures a thorough evaluation of the workers' experiences. Additionally, the socio-economic analysis provides a detailed understanding of the workforce's demographics, highlighting important factors like gender disparities. The combination of these elements demonstrates a well-rounded and methodologically sound approach to addressing the research questions.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. :</p>	<p>The references included are recent, which is great. However, it would be beneficial to include more related literature to strengthen the study's context. Adding references on labor conditions, gender disparities in the agricultural workforce, and evaluating worker satisfaction would provide a more comprehensive background.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communications. However, there are a few areas where minor improvements could enhance clarity and readability. Please ensure that the terminologies are consistent and addressing some grammatical issues like “percent” instead of “per cent” will further elevate the manuscript’s quality. Lastly, it would be preferable to use American English consistently throughout the manuscript. For example, since "labor" is used (American English), it would be better to use "behavior" instead of "behaviour" (British English) for consistency.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>To enhance readability, it would be helpful to include percentage values in the tables as well.</p> <p>Also, the citation and reference in the paper must be using Mendeley with IEEE Style.</p> <p>doi: 10.1109/iSES47678.2019.00020. (right) doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physa.2019.122537. (wrong)</p>	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mae SA. Lustre
Department, University & Country	Central Bicol State University of Agriculture, Philippines