

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_124494
Title of the Manuscript:	Resource Use Efficiency and Constraints faced by Potato Growers in Kannauj District of Uttar Pradesh
Type of the Article	Original article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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 a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is of scientific importance by using economic tools to compare different sizes of farmers. Besides that, it addresses one of the most important crops in India, which is potato. Its strengths include the use of elasticity of production and marginal value productivity that can show returns to scale. However, some more modifications and corrections should be made to ensure the quality of the paper.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it is, but to be clearer, the author should mention the country of the study in it as well.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	No, it is not. The abstract should be modified by including the specific objectives of the study, the sampling method, the year and duration of the study, and the conclusion. By adding all this information, the abstract will become outstanding.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<p>The manuscript has all necessary components of a typical paper. However, some revision should be made, and below are comments that should be taken into consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The introduction is written to draw the attention to the study, but it has some mistakes in English writing and using units. Besides that, some paragraphs are written without proper citations, so more references should be added. - The method elaborates on types of farmers, but references are needed to support the classification. Besides that, economic formulas are used, but they are provided without references. Another point is the way the method is written; it is not well organized yet. - The results and conclusion section is written as one, but the discussion part is missing, so it is hard to know if the study is new, similar, or different to previous studies. Besides that, the results use notes such as asterisks to show significance, but the tables do not have asterisks. - The conclusion contains so much information, but it does not reflect the main points of the study. 	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	In terms of correctness, the manuscript needs improvements in terms of English writing and presenting the results. If the author can use sample papers available online in the journal to learn how the writing is done in a good way, then the manuscript can suit the journal. Besides that, English proofreading is needed to reduce mistakes in English writing and write clear and short results.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Many references are given, but some paragraphs are written without any citations to support. Therefore, it is advised that the author should use more references to support them.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English writing is considered moderate, so proofreading is strongly required.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript should be considered for publication only when the author take serious account of the comments by addressing them clearly, properly, and carefully.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hin Lyhour
Department, University & Country	Royal University of Agriculture, Cambodia