

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_129731
Title of the Manuscript:	A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF NEURAL NETWORK AND WAVELET DECOMPOSITION MODELS FOR PRICE FORECASTING OF TOMATO
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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The study provides a detailed economic analysis of papaya marketing channels in North-Eastern Karnataka, which is valuable for stakeholders in the agricultural sector. It highlights the cost efficiency and price spread of different marketing channels, aiding farmers and policymakers in making informed decisions. The findings are relevant for optimizing marketing strategies and ensuring better profitability for farmers.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is appropriate but could be made more precise by including the term "Economic Analysis" for better alignment with the study's objectives.</p>	
<p>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>	<p>The abstract provides a good summary of the study, but it lacks explicit mention of the statistical or analytical methods used. Consider specifying the key findings in numerical terms for better impact (e.g., exact price spread, percentage differences in efficiency). The conclusion should be clearer about policy implications.</p>	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The structure is appropriate, but some sections (e.g., Methodology) could be more concise. • The discussion on marketing channels (Section 3.1) should highlight key trends in a more structured manner. <p>Major Revisions Required (Critical Concerns & Weaknesses) Conceptual & Analytical Weaknesses Lack of Economic Justification for Certain Findings</p> <p>While the study identifies Channel III as the most efficient, it does not explain the structural barriers that prevent farmers from shifting to this channel despite its higher profitability. The risk-reward tradeoff between pre-harvest contractors (PHCs) and direct market access is briefly mentioned but lacks a solid theoretical discussion.</p> <p>Marketing Cost Calculation Needs More Rigor</p> <p>The study defines marketing cost (MC) as $MC = CF + CD$, but this ignores key cost factors such as spoilage rates, interest costs on credit, and opportunity costs for farmers.</p> <p>Insufficient Use of Statistical Tests</p> <p>The manuscript presents descriptive statistics but lacks statistical significance testing for price spread, cost variations, and efficiency comparisons.</p> <p>No Policy Simulation for APMC Regulation</p> <p>The recommendation that Agricultural Produce Market Committees (APMCs) regulate PHCs is stated but not justified with data or examples.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Include more recent studies (post-2020) on agricultural marketing and price spread in India.</p>	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	manuscript contains several grammatical errors and awkward sentence structures	
Optional/General 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:	Jaslam Poolakkal
Department, University & Country	University of Idaho, United States