

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_127413
Title of the Manuscript:	An Identification of cost of cultivation and returns of cluster bean in Gird Region of Madhya Pradesh
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>

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.	This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> helps to develop new hypotheses and build upon scientific discoveries on identification of cost of cultivation and returns of cluster bean; advances knowledge on the subject studied sharing scientific information with the academic/scientific community about findings of this study; 	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	As I understood, the title of the article is suitable; but, it would be better if you change the word IDENTIFICATION with other more appropriate words like ASSESSMENT, EVALUATION.	
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.	Include the research method, data analysis method, conclusion, and recommendations to make the abstract of the article comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.	
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>Taking into account the points and questions mentioned below, I argue that the manuscript falls short to say: it's sentences are scientifically correct; and it's scientifically robust and technically sound.</p> <p>Abstract As mentioned earlier, its abstract is not comprehensive.</p> <p>The material and methods section is the most unaddressed and, I suggest, it should address, at least, the following questions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> ABSTRACT: What is the research method the study employed and what is the data analysis method of the study? What the author concluded and recommended from the study? INTRODUCTION: Who said the points raised (CITATION)? Where is the related literature reviewed about "cost of cultivation and returns" of cluster bean? MATERIALS AND METHODS: What is the research design (descriptive, diagnostic/explanatory, ..), and the research approach (quantitative, qualitative, or both)? What is the population of the study? Is the number of sampled traders 22? And are they included in the 90 farmers or not? If they are not included in the 90, is the sample size 112? RESULT AND DISCUSSION: from the primary data presented in the tables, which one are collected 	

Review Form 3

	from the FARMERS and TRADERS? Where is THE SECONDARY DATA collected from government offices (agriculture Mandi of Sabalgarh and from Government publication of the Directorate of Economics and Statistics Government of Madhya Pradesh)?	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are insufficient and not recent (only 2 of the 10 are recent)	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Muhsin Yimam
Department, University & Country	Ethiopia