

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_129235
Title of the Manuscript:	A Study on Constraint Analysis of Rice Cultivation in Korba District of Chhattisgarh
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>

Review Form 3

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This is undoubtedly an important study as rice is the main staple crop of Chhattisgarh. Its constraint analysis would give meaningful insight to the scientific community for designing proper interventions for maximization of production and profit	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is okay; however, a concise title would be enough- eg. "Constraint Analysis of Rice Cultivation in Korba District of Chhattisgarh"	
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 is fairly comprehensive. However, there are several standard grammatical errors. A sentence should not start with "And". The font size should be the same and as per the guidelines. I hope the authors or editing team will address the issue.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The study seems satisfactory with some correction. In this regard, the following points might be considered- <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The standard grammatical and scientific format as per the Journal's guidelines must be followed strictly. 2. Several references are stated wrong; some of them are: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Tanveer Ahmed, 2006 should be Ahmed, 2006 b. P. Jwala at all, 2019 should be Jwala <i>et al.</i>, 2019 c. Tashkalma <i>et al.</i> (2010), Zalkuwi (2012) [9] & Suryavanshi <i>et al.</i> (2019) should be Tashkalma <i>et al.</i> (2010), Zalkuwi (2012) [9] and Suryavanshi <i>et al.</i> (2019) 3. The full form of each abbreviation should be stated when it is first mentioned. 4. Conformity of terms/units should be maintained throughout the manuscript 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Then (10) to twelve (12) references would be sufficient. Some references mentioned in the main body are not mentioned in the reference section, eg. Tashkalma <i>et al.</i> (2010); Suryavanshi <i>et al.</i> (2019). Such references need to be included.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Moderate improvement as a whole would improve the manuscript.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Rekhashree Kalita
Department, University & Country	Assam Agricultural University, India