

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_115903
Title of the Manuscript:	Principle Component analysis for Forecasting of pre-harvest Rapeseed and Mustard yield based on meteorological parameters
Type of the Article	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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript is extremely important for scientific community as it detailed the significant contribution of meteorological parameters to obtain a trustworthy forecast of the yield of Rapeseed and Mustard</p> <p>2. "Forecasting of pre-harvest rapeseed and mustard yield based on meteorological parameters through principle component analysis" would have been apt title.</p> <p>3. Yes the abstract of the article have meticulously represented the essence of the manuscript.</p> <p>4. Yes the subsections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate but if possible acknowledgement should be added.</p> <p>5. Yes the manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>6. Yes the references were sufficient but 4-5more reference would add scientific validity to the document. Also the references are not in alphabetical manner.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language of the article is suitable for scholarly communications but can be improved by adding more scientific reasons in the result &amp; discussion part of the manuscript.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

### 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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Niroj Kumar Jena</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Krishi Vgyan Kendra, India</b>