

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_117489
Title of the Manuscript:	EXTENSION STRATEGIES AND MODELS IN AGRI TRADING THROUGH FARMER PRODUCER COMPANIES (FPCs): A WAY TOWARDS SUSTAINABILITY
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>)

Review Form 1.7

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>Yes, the author suggested few points to incorporate and remove from the abstract.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes. Author should follow the guideline of the society and rewrite the references accordingly. References are not arranged in alphabetical sequence, kindly rearrange.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rewrite the abstract as mentioned in the above abstract's comment. • Take care about mentioning the comma in several sentences. • The phenomenon that happened should be written in the past tense. • Avoid more writing without sense. Give the concrete points with logic and support of reference. • Grammatical mistakes are also present; correct them before resubmission. • Kindly follow the guidelines to write the references and recheck all the references mentioned carefully. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Grammatical mistakes are there so authors need to correct before resubmission.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Discussion should write in past tense, whereas importance and policy implication should be in future tense. So, author should take care of this before resubmission.</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:	Manish Sharma
Department, University & Country	College of Horticulture and Research Station-Saja, Mahatma Gandhi University of Horticulture and Forestry (Durg), India