

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Research Journal of Agriculture</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_ARJA_121304</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A Review on Production and Marketing of Betel Vine</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

## 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>The manuscript (MS) could have been an important one for the scientific community, but it has not been written properly as planned. The scientific name of a plant is usually written in italicised form, but here the author(s) have overlooked it while writing the botanical name of betel vine. In Table 1, Orissa (it is now written as Odisha) is mentioned in Sl. 3 with regard to its contribution % of betel vine in India, but in text it is missing. All along the Odisha coast, the betel vine is an important cash crop for many farmers. The author(s) could have discussed about this in the MS. Under Review of Concepts (Table 2: Conceptual Framework) – only the definitions of the terms from 3.1 to 3.9 have been mentioned without any description with relevance to betel vine. The conceptual frame work has, thus, become meaningless here.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>Title is Ok.</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. Repetition of sentence is clearly visible. For example “social, religious, and cultural activities and significantly contributing to the economy through employment and foreign exchange” is repeated just after three lines. “Percentage analysis, chi-square tests, Garrett ranking technique, and Likert scales” are mentioned in abstract, but are not found in text. Importance of conceptual frame work and how it has guided the review process are not understood.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>Not at all.</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>The discussion under the section 4 (Review of Previous Studies) is more or less superfluous. Only the findings of different workers have been mentioned without giving any importance to corroborate each other which would have increased the significance of the paper. In the marketing channel analysis other crops like cowpea, garlic, potato are mentioned without giving any correlation to betel vine crop. Pest issue is cited, but nothing has been mentioned about the diseases, causal organisms and the magnitude of loss because of the diseases to the farmers. Table 2 is not at all informative and there is no necessity of this one. Even in Table 1, there is not much information. There is no Figure in this MS. Generally a review article is expected to contain much information on the subject to which others working on that subject follow. In that regard, this MS has many deficiencies.</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>Literature review is not sufficient. Recent references are few.</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>English language ok, but scientific input is inadequate.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</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>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Surjendu Kumar Dey</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Fakir Mohan University, India</b>