

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_128420
Title of the Manuscript:	Attaining Livelihood Security Through Horticulture Development in Karnataka
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 work offers valuable information on contribution of the Horticulture development to the attaining of livelihood security. However, the work needs to be well presented with emphasis on livelihood security review of related studies and clearing defining your research gap.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable	
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 because of absence of analytical techniques. Tools used to derive result should be stated.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Is scientifically correct but the research questions are properly stated /specified according to findings and methodology well specified.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are very insufficient and are not recent. The author should look for related literatures on this topic	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes with minor corrections	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The methodology is not clearly stated, the survey tool is not stated and the sampling frame is not mentioned. We need to know the reason for the choice of sampling method.	

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:	Nwoko Ijeoma C.
Department, University & Country	National Biotechnology Research and Development Agency, Nigeria