

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_122197
Title of the Manuscript:	Costs and Returns of Potato Cultivation in Kannauj District of Uttar Pradesh
Type of the Article	

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.	This manuscript provides an economic analysis of potato cultivation in Kannauj district, Uttar Pradesh, highlighting the costs, returns, and cropping patterns across different farm sizes. However, a more robust discussion on the broader implications of these findings of this study beyond the local context is needed.	
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.	<p>The abstract is disjointed and lacks clarity. It jumps between various points without a clear flow. It is essential to summarize the key findings and methodologies used succinctly.</p> <p>The abstract has several grammatical errors and awkward phrasing. Punctuation and sentence structure need revision.</p> <p>The abstract could be more precise in detailing the findings. While it mentions the average cost of cultivation and income, it lacks context on the significance of these findings within the broader scope of potato cultivation in the region.</p>	
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 appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound due to its systematic approach to collecting and analyzing data and applying specific cost concepts. However, the robustness could be further validated if the manuscript included a more detailed discussion on potential limitations and the external validity of the findings beyond the study area.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	<p>The references are insufficient The few references cited are relevant but appear somewhat outdated. More recent studies should be included to provide a current perspective on potato cultivation economics.</p> <p>The formatting of references needs to be consistent and follow the journal's guidelines. There are inconsistencies in the citation style used, such as missing commas and incorrect capitalization.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>NO. The English quality is poor and needs to be thoroughly revised.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Include the country in the study title</p> <p>The introduction is somewhat not concise. Some aspects of the introduction are irrelevant. The focus should be on framing the research question and its importance.</p> <p>The introduction references various potato varieties and their significance, but it lacks a thorough review of relevant economic studies or frameworks that would ground the current research.</p> <p>Materials and Methods</p> <p>The multi-stage stratified sampling design is appropriate, but more details on how the villages and farmers were selected would enhance the robustness of the methodology.</p> <p>Results and Discussion</p> <p>The data is presented in tables, which is effective. However, the discussion of the results lacks depth. For example, while the study mentions the average cost of cultivation, it doesn't delve into the reasons behind the differences observed between farm sizes.</p> <p>Also, some of the results/figures presented within the text are different from what is in the tables. i.e Table 3 (cropping patterns). Others need to be checked.</p> <p>The results are not critically analyzed. There is a need to link the findings to broader economic theories or previous studies. Why does the cropping intensity decrease with farm size? What are the implications of the input-output ratio?</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>There is a lack of discussion on the practical implications of the findings. How can the results inform policy or farming practices in the region?</p> <p>The conclusion needs to be strengthened by suggestions for future research or a discussion on the current study's limitations.</p> <p>General Comments</p> <p>Language and Grammar: The manuscript requires significant language editing. Many sentences are awkwardly phrased or contain grammatical errors that hinder comprehension.</p> <p>Flow and Organization: The paper's overall flow needs improvement. Sections are disjointed, and the narrative could be more coherent with better transitions between topics..</p> <p>Recommendations: The manuscript would benefit from a thorough revision focusing on language clarity, more in-depth analysis, and a stronger emphasis on the study's implications. Additionally, a clearer articulation of the research question and objectives at the beginning would set a more focused direction for the entire paper.</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:	Caleb Adewale
Department, University & Country	University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff, United States