

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_130652
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Growth and Trend Pattern of Rice Crop Production in Selected States of India
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.	The manuscript is important for scientific community. It may play a critical role in advancing the scientific community by serving as a primary medium for the dissemination of research findings. It may enable to share novel discoveries, methodologies, and analyses with peers worldwide, fostering collaboration and innovation.	The authors are highly thankful to the reviewer for the valuable comments on the manuscript.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article 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 of the article is not comprehensive. It may include time periods covered, name of the states, and originality of the research.	The abstract has been rewritten according to the reviewer's suggestions, and highlighted in the revised manuscript.
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically correct.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and recent.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments	There should be separate "Literature Review" part. The conclusion part should include 'policy implications'.	The corrections suggested by the reviewer have been incorporated in the revised manuscript, and highlighted.

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>	