

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_127294
Title of the Manuscript:	GROWTH OF TOTAL FACTOR PRODUCTIVITY OF MAJOR SEED SPICES IN GUJARAT
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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 contributes significantly to the scientific community by analysing the growth of Total Factor Productivity (TFP) for major seed spices in Gujarat, a state pivotal to India's spice economy. By employing the Tornqvist-Theil index, the study provides a detailed and rigorous analysis of input and output indices, which are crucial for understanding productivity trends.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	For More clarity, you might consider: "Analysing Growth Trends of Total Factor Productivity in Major Seed Spices of Gujarat."	
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.	Author can <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mention specific implications of the findings for policy or industry. Clarify how the results might inform improvements in agricultural practices or resource efficiency. Suggested revision: Add a sentence addressing how these findings can guide sustainable agricultural practices or policy decisions to enhance productivity.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the manuscript's structure is logical, with clear sections for the abstract, introduction, methodology, results, discussion, and conclusion.	
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.	The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound, employing a well-established methodology (Tornqvist-Theil index) for productivity analysis. The data sources appear reliable, and the analytical approach is thorough. Additionally, the use of Compound Growth Rates (CGR) to classify productivity trends adds depth to the analysis. The manuscript effectively links empirical findings with prior research, strengthening its validity.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references cited are relevant, but the inclusion of more recent literature (2020–2024) could enhance the study's contemporary relevance.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is clear and suitable for scholarly communication but could benefit from minor grammar improvements and consistent terminology usage.	
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:	B. Devi Priya
Department, University & Country	PSGR Krishnammal College for Women, India