

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEAI_123079</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A study on socio-economic status of fishers in Khammam district of Telangana.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>1. Although the Indian economy depends heavily on fishing, fishermen's financial circumstances are quite dire.                  2. Research articles of this kind ought to be produced to examine India's fishermen's current socioeconomic conditions.                  3. New policies and strategies that address the intricate issue of fishermen's rights in a relevant and economical manner need to be developed in India. In this manner, this type of scientific research should be published.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>Absolutely fine, fully matching with the subject of the article.</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>No, the abstract must be revised.                  1. The author does not have to divide the abstract into sections based on the article's body.                  2. The numerical facts need not be mentioned in the abstract. Just highlight the most significant findings.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>Sure. There's no suggestion for correction.</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>1. The writing in this article is subpar.                  2. Statistics itself are insufficient.                  3. The data source is not identified.                  4. No current citations.                  5. The article's implications for further research have not been addressed by the author.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>                  =</p>	<p>No, Author must include recent and relevant references in the Introduction, Conclusion part.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>This research article must be re written and English needs to be improved.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>NO</p>	

### Review Form 3

#### **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>	Yes I agreed with the reviewer and made the required corrections

#### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Subhadip Pal</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>The Neotia University, India</b>