

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_125476
Title of the Manuscript:	Vegetable Production Techniques for Livelihood security for Small and Marginal Farmers - A Review
Type of the Article	Review 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

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 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.	Improved and advanced Vegetable Production Techniques is not only important to boost country's production level of different vegetables in different region but it is also important as it contributes to for Livelihood security for Small and Marginal Farmers and nutritional security of the people. Farmers must be encouraged to adopt recent advances like improved and HY varieties, IPM, Plasticulture techniques, precision farming etc. to boost vegetable production and make it sustainable.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Yes Make changes as suggested in the manuscript	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. But grammatical mistakes have been found here and there that must be thoroughly revised and corrected. Add the key words Objective needs to be rewritten for better clarity. In addition to above, makeake changes as suggested in the manuscript	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Yes, references sufficient and recent. Some more recent one may be added if possible.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications. Must be revised as per suggestions.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Sangeeta Shree
Department, University & Country	Bihar Agricultural University, India