

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_121993
Title of the Manuscript:	An Economic Analysis of Terrace Rice Cultivation in Senapati District of Manipur
Type of the Article	An Economic Analysis of Terrace Rice Cultivation in Senapati District of Manipur

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

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 manuscript is very much important for knowing the cost of cultivation of terrace rice. So far my knowledge goes; a very little work is done in this topic. It will be very much important information for enhancing the knowledge on cost of cultivation of terrace rice especially north eastern hilly region of India.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of the article is justified	
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.	The article is very much comprehensive and time demand.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, subsection and structure of manuscript is appropriate.	
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.	This manuscript is scientifically correct as it has estimated cost, return and production function. Test for significance are also scientific. It is robust & technically sound as it has done statistical analysis categorically and scientifically.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Recent reference should be included.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The article is suitable for scholarly communication it should be more simple and lucid	
Optional/General comments	This article is very much useful for future planning of farmers income.	

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:	Pulakabha Choudhury
Department, University & Country	Assam Agricultural University (AAU), India