

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_112075
Title of the Manuscript:	ESTIMATION OF INCOME, EXPENDITURE AND RESOURCE USE PATTERN OF GROUNDNUT IN THANDRAMPATTU BLOCK OF TIRUVANNAMALAI DISTRICT
Type of the 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes!</p> <p>Yes!</p> <p>The abstract of the article is good. Though I am suggesting that it should flow in the following order; background, objective, methodological synopsis, findings, conclusion and recommendations. Yes! The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>The references are alright but the arrangements are not properly done based on APA sixth or seventh edition. I suggest that the references should be re-arranged based on the acceptable standard and edition of the Journal.</p> <p>I suggest that the number of hypotheses should not be more than the number of the specific objectives of the study. The hypotheses are to be formulated from objective one to four. The title should also reads, Hypotheses and not Hypothesis since they are more than one.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes!</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The article is very good and can contribute immensely to knowledge.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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:	John Wajim
Department, University & Country	Federal University Wukari, Nigeria