

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_123020
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Human Labour on the Cost of Cultivation Expenses of Major Cereal Crops in India
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	The conclusions of the research are not contributing to the scientific knowledge. The study only describes some common statistics about the costs, without scientific nor methodological contribution. It is important that the authors rethink the methodological design to multivariate classification, causal-correlation or time series model for evaluating the potential knowledge contribution.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It does not reflect the real content of the study. I suggest to study: "Factors that contributing to the cost of cultivation of major crops"; however, it is important to evaluate the diverse factors of variables in the literature review. For the current study, the title is not correct too.	
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.	I suggest to rethink the paper with the indications of the first comment.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	I suggest to rethink the paper with the indications of the first comment.	
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.	I suggest to rethink the paper with the indications of the first comment. The study does not have scientific contribution. The study does not have robust methodological design.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Only six of 28 references have less than five years of antiquity. The authors must realize a deep literature review before the beginning of a scientific study.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English redaction quality in general terms is OK; however, some diverse sentences require proof-reading.	
Optional/General comments	My recommendation is to reject the paper because there are not knowledge contribution nor rigorous scientific methodology.	

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Emigdio Antonio Alfaro Paredes
Department, University & Country	Centro de Investigacion Cientifica e Innovacion Global, Peru