

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_128922
Title of the Manuscript:	Yield gap analysis of Fieldpea in Senapati District, Manipur, India
Type of the Article	Research 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.	For the scientific community, the yield gap analysis of fieldpea in Senapati District, Manipur, is essential since it sheds light on the factors restricting crop productivity in the area. Agricultural problems like soil fertility, climate variability, and pest control can be identified by researchers by comparing prospective and actual yields. This analysis aids in the creation of region-specific interventions and the promotion of sustainable agricultural methods that may be used in other agro-ecological zones that are comparable. Last but not least, it advances understanding of crop science, resource optimization, and climate resilience in the world of science.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title can be remodified. Evaluation of Yield Gap Analysis of Field pea and its Benefits in Senapati District, Manipur, India	
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.	No. The abstract is not comprehensive enough. The content of the abstarct should be summarized as follows: (i) Background and objective of the sudy (ii) Materials and methods (iii) Results (iv) Conclusion. These should be comprehensively summarized.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	It is correct but needs some modifications and proofs.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are not sufficient. More references should be added as stated in the manuscript that was reviewed.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes it is.	
Optional/General comments	The methodology should be more detailed. The materials and methods section was not satisfactorily justified.	

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:	Orekoya Elias Similoluwa
Department, University & Country	Augustine University Ilara-Epe Lagos State, Nigeria