

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_120235
Title of the Manuscript:	Trends in area, production and productivity of castor in Telangana.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for 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

<u>Compulsory</u> 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 few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript aims to understand the growth rate of castors in Telangana. However, it does not provide any implication. What is the benefit of getting the estimated CAGR? The author should provide some discussion why there was a decreasing trend in both castor area and production but a positive growth rate in castor productivity in major districts.	
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 addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes. However, more specific suggestion should be provided.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The growth rates were calculated for the entire period from 2001-02 to 2022-23 and two periods: Period I (2001-02 to 2011-12) and Period II (2012-13 to 2022-23). However, the author should add the reasons why we need to divide the whole sample into 2 periods and why 2011-12 is the cutoff point.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	Yes.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 3

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:	Woradee Jongadsayakul
Department, University & Country	Kasetsart University, Thailand