

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes it is very suitable to publish	
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 Abstract must be 250 words only. Keywords must be italicize	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	To determine if the subsections and structure of your manuscript are appropriate, consider these key factors: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Clear Organization: Ensure your manuscript has a logical flow. Typically, it should include sections like Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion, and Conclusion. Subsections: Use subsections to break down complex ideas. Each subsection should have a clear purpose and contribute to the overall narrative. Consistency: Maintain a consistent format throughout. If you use headings for subsections, keep the style uniform. Relevance: Each subsection should directly relate to your main topic. Avoid including unnecessary information that might distract from your main argument. Length and Depth: Ensure that each subsection is appropriately detailed for the manuscript's purpose and audience. Avoid overly lengthy sections that could lose the reader's interest. Audience Consideration: Tailor your structure to the expected format of your target journal or audience. 	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically	This manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness through its rigorous methodology, which is clearly articulated and replicable. The results are presented with appropriate statistical analysis, providing confidence in their validity and reliability. Additionally, the discussion	

Review Form 3

<p>robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>contextualizes the findings within existing literature, highlighting their relevance and potential impact on the field. Overall, the comprehensive approach to data collection, analysis, and interpretation underscores the manuscript's credibility and contributes to a deeper understanding of the research topic.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :</p>	<p>To evaluate the sufficiency and recency of the references in your manuscript, consider the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Coverage of Key Literature: Ensure that the references include foundational studies and recent advancements in your field. A well-rounded reference list should reflect both classic and current research. Recency: Aim for recent publications, ideally from the last 5-10 years, to ensure the manuscript reflects the latest knowledge and trends. Diversity of Sources: Include a variety of sources, such as peer-reviewed journals, books, and reputable conference proceedings, to enhance the manuscript's credibility. <p>If you can provide a list of your current references or specify your research area, I can suggest additional relevant studies that would strengthen your manuscript!</p>	
<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>To assess the language and English quality of your article for scholarly communication, consider the following aspects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Clarity and Precision: The language should be clear and precise, avoiding vague terms. Each sentence should effectively convey your ideas. Technical Vocabulary: Use appropriate terminology relevant to your field. Ensure that complex concepts are explained well, especially for a broader audience. Grammar and Syntax: Check for grammatical correctness, proper sentence structure, and punctuation. Avoid run-on sentences and ensure that the text flows smoothly. Formal Tone: The tone should be formal and academic, suitable for scholarly readership. Avoid colloquialisms and overly casual language. Cohesion and Coherence: Ideas should be logically connected, with effective transitions between sentences and paragraphs. <p>If you have specific excerpts you'd like feedback on, feel free to share! Otherwise, consider running your manuscript through a grammar-check tool or seeking feedback from a peer for an additional perspective.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Jose B. Baltero III</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Capiz State University, Main Campus, Philippines</p>