

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_112260
Title of the Manuscript:	Marketing Behaviour of Young Chrysanthemum Growers in Salem District of Tamil Nadu
Type of the Article	Short Research Article

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes, the manuscript addresses significant issues related to agriculture, youth engagement, and the floriculture sector, making it relevant and potentially impactful for the scientific community, policymakers, and practitioners in the field.</p> <p>2. The current title effectively conveys the article's theme. However, an alternative title could be "An Investigation into the Marketing Practices of Young Chrysanthemum Growers in Salem District, Tamil Nadu: Insights from Agricultural Economics Research" for a slightly different perspective.</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract provides a thorough and comprehensive overview of the article, summarising its key points and findings concisely.</p> <p>4. Yes, the subsections and overall structure of the manuscript appear to be well organised and appropriate. Each section flows logically into the next, providing a clear and coherent presentation of the information.</p> <p>5. Yes, I believe the manuscript is scientifically correct based on the thorough review and analysis of the content.</p> <p>6. The references seem to be adequate, but it would be beneficial to add more sources (15–20 references) to strengthen the reliability and enough information to understand the description.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Fachrurazi
Department, University & Country	Pontianak State Institute of Islamic Studies, Indonesia