

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_122210
Title of the Manuscript:	Analyzing Price Behaviour and Constraints in Marketing of Small Onion in Tamil Nadu
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)
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript holds significant value for the scientific community, as it explores price behavior in small onion cultivation within Tamil Nadu, while fail to identify marketing constraints. Its focus on a niche crop contributes to a deeper understanding of market dynamics, with potential to improve both smallholder farmers' incomes and overall market efficiency.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Analyzing Price Behaviour and Constraints in Marketing of Onion in Tamil Nadu</p> <p>Suggestion: NHRDF and NHB do not provide variety-wise or size-wise data. Therefore, it would be more appropriate to replace 'small onion' with 'onion' in the title.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Add 'high price of fertilizers, pesticides and machineries'- machineries word missing in abstract</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Please justify, your second objective, as the results do not appear to align with it. Your findings highlight production-related constraints, such as labor costs and fertilizer expenses. However, you have not adequately explained the rationale behind selecting 40 retailers and 20 wholesalers in different proportions.</p> <p>Additionally, there is an error in the citation of the 12th reference. Kumar et al. conducted their work in Haryana, not Maharashtra. Furthermore, the reference to Kumar et al. has been duplicated in both the 12th and 14th references. Please review and correct these discrepancies.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>No, I do not believe that the technical robustness of the sample selection and analysis is sufficient. The results and objectives are not aligned, failing to clearly communicate the intended outcomes. Furthermore, the supporting citations for the results are also inadequate.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>It is necessary to incorporate recent studies that provide support for his/her findings.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Major revision needed. Yes, the language and English quality of the revised text are suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mulla Areef
Department, University & Country	Institute of Economic Growth, University of Delhi, India