

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Experimental Agriculture International |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JEAI_126632 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | A Review on Long-Term Vision of Pulses Economy in India "Pulses in India: Comprehensive Analysis of Production, Challenges, and Strategic Vision for 2030" |
| Type of the Article | Review Article |

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

| <u>Compulsory</u> 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. | | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | | |
| 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. | | |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? | | |
| 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. | | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. = | | |

Review Form 3

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| Minor REVISION comments | | |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | | |
| Optional/General comments | <div>1. Introduction should be discussed elaboratively with highlighting the title of the manuscript.</div> <div>2. Methodology need to be included.</div> <div>3. Every figure and table need be discussed in the text before mention the figure and table. The authors directly presented the figures and table just after heading with any discussion in the text.</div> <div>4. There was chronological number of the references in the text.</div> <div>5. Maximum suggestions and recommendations were not mentioned following proper format of the review article.</div> <div>6. Relevant comments were also mention in the reviewed manuscript.</div> <div>So, my suggestion is this manuscript need be rewrite for publication in any quality journal.</div> <div>PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT</div> | <div>The suggestions have been incorporated in the original manuscript.</div> <div>This is a review paper on pulses economy status therefore no methodology has been used in this study.</div> |

PART 2:

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | Reviewer's comment | Author's comment (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) |
| Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? | (If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details) | |