

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_124807
Title of the Manuscript:	Economic Evaluation of the Planting Period and Retting Techniques in the Production of Quality Kenaf Fibre
Type of the Article	

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>

**PART 1: Review Comments**

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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 "Economic Evaluation of the Planting Period and Retting Techniques in the Production of Quality Kenaf Fibre" is significant for the scientific community as it addresses critical factors influencing kenaf production's economic viability and sustainability. By systematically analyzing how different planting periods and retting methods affect kenaf fiber's yield and quality, this research contributes valuable insights that can optimize agricultural practices and improve profitability for farmers. Moreover, it aligns with the growing interest in sustainable and environmentally friendly materials, making it relevant in developing biocomposites and alternative fibers. Therefore, the study not only enhances the understanding of kenaf cultivation but also aids policymakers in promoting effective agricultural strategies within the textile and bioproduct industries.  Even though the study is a little unclear, there is still room for improvement. Overall, the work is valid, making it a useful contribution to the scientific community. However, before the paper is approved, it needs to be revised. The writing needs to be much better. Sometimes the writing is merely bad English, but other times it's unclear, making it hard to understand the authors' views and points of view. There are a few mistakes in the writing, which might be improved. The authors should carefully review the entire work.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Rewriting the abstract is necessary. The abstract fails to emphasize the significant findings of this study. The author should rearrange the abstract and conclusion with the important results and closing remarks.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	The manuscript "Economic Evaluation of the Planting Period and Retting Techniques in the Production of Quality Kenaf Fibre" is likely considered scientifically robust and technically sound due to its comprehensive approach that incorporates both economic analysis and agronomic practices. By examining the effects of different planting periods and retting techniques on the quality of kenaf fibre.	

**Review Form 3**

<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>-</p>		
<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Even though the study is a little unclear, there is still room for improvement. Overall, the work is valid, making it a useful contribution to the scientific community. However, before the paper is approved, it needs to be revised. The writing needs to be much better. Sometimes the writing is merely bad English, but other times it's unclear, making it hard to understand the authors' views and points of view. There are a few mistakes in the writing, which might be improved. The authors should carefully review the entire work.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>We looked at the paper "<b>Economic Evaluation of the Planting Period and Retting Techniques in the Production of Quality Kenaf Fibre.</b>" Even though the study is a little unclear, there is still room for improvement. Overall, the work is valid, making it a useful contribution to the scientific community. However, before the paper is approved, it needs to be revised. The writing needs to be much better. Sometimes the writing is merely bad English, but other times it's unclear, making it hard to understand the authors' views and points of view. There are a few mistakes in the writing, which might be improved. The authors should carefully review the entire work.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rewriting the abstract is necessary. The abstract fails to emphasize the significant findings of this study. The author should rearrange the abstract and conclusion with the important results and closing remarks.</li> <li>2. The scale of tables and figures needs to be updated. It might use some improvement in quality and scale and put it at the center.</li> <li>3. The introduction/background literature review is the foundation for the research's originality. You must relate the goals of your article to the state of the art in the introduction. Kindly provide a succinct and lucid overview of the state of the art after the literature review. Clearly explain the earlier research to which you are alluding. What Research Contributions and Gaps Exist? Please be aware that the manuscript cannot be taken further unless there is an obvious research gap and the work is innovative.</li> <li>4. In the materials and methods, try to add each measuring instrument's model, manufacturer, and accuracy.</li> <li>5. Why did you select June, July, and August for Planting dates (Month)?</li> <li>6. The outcomes are not well discussed. Please make a deeper and more comprehensive literature review referenced from your empirical data in the discussion section. Further research should be conducted to compare the results with those of others.</li> <li>7. The conclusion section is not correctly written, it needs improvement ..... Back ground ---objective -methodology...result.....recommendations.....</li> </ol>	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Dawit Tessema Ebissa</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>Ethiopian textile and fashion technology institute, Bahir Dar University, Ethiopia</b></p>