

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | Journal of Experimental Agriculture International  |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_JEAI_117095   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Impact of IPM Technology Input and Yield Disparities on Cotton in Vidarbha Region of Maharashtra: Principal Component Approach |
| Type of the 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://www.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/editorial-policy> )

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?<br/>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable?<br/>(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>1. Yes, This manuscript has important for scientific community.</p> <p>2. Yes, title was suitable.</p> <p>3. Yes, but abstract was poorly organized and presented. Need to improve</p> <p>4. Yes, subsection and structure of the manuscript was appropriate. Major correction was required.<br/><br/>Introduction, methodology, result and discussion, conclusion all are need to improve</p> <p>5. Yes, manuscript was scientifically correct if experiment was done properly.</p> <p>6. Yes. Reference link absent. Many reference need to insert. Give update and latest reference, reference link with DOI number.</p> <p>7. Give explanation of every abbreviations.</p> |   |
| <p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>  | <p>The language of the paper needs a careful editing for the international readership</p>   |   |
| <p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>  | <p>Major correction required</p>  |   |

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

|   | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <b>Author's comment</b> <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> |
|---|--|---|
| <b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b> | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> |   |

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name:                            | <b>Pradip Hajong</b>  |
| Department, University & Country | <b>Bangladesh Agricultural Research Institute, Bangladesh</b> |