

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_126699
Title of the Manuscript:	Yield Gap Assessment in Senegal and Senegal River Valley: Factors affecting the yield gap and post-harvest activities
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

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.	Yes, the Manuscript is important for the scientific community because the quality of the article suitable for scholarly considerations with more clarity The manuscript on yield gap assessment in Senegal and the Senegal River Valley is important for the scientific community as it addresses critical factors influencing agricultural productivity, especially in a region facing food security challenges. Understanding the yield gap allows researchers and policymakers to identify specific areas for improvement, optimize resource allocation, and implement targeted interventions that can significantly enhance crop yields.	
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	
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.	Yes, it is scientifically robust and technically sound in grammar, engagement and delivery. the manuscript should be well-cited, it focuses on post-harvest activities is vital for reducing losses and improving overall efficiency in agricultural systems, which is often overlooked in yield gap analyses. I appreciate this manuscript for its comprehensive approach, as it combines yield gap analysis and practical insights into post-harvest practices, which can lead to more sustainable agricultural development in Senegal.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	Yes Some of the References/citations are not available, eg. of References like Alexander, ANDREW KECK, 2011. And a lot more, please formal your reference to meet the journal standard	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
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:	Usman Mohammed Ishaq
Department, University & Country	Federal Polytechnic Monguno, Nigeria