

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_125914
Title of the Manuscript:	Estimation of Marketed Surplus and Marketing Efficiency of Milk in Andhra Pradesh
Type of the Article	Original 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: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	1. There are increasing per capita income in the research area fuelling the demand of milk. 2. District's vast rural base offer immense potential for growth and development of dairying 3. Small-scale milk producers need to form co-operative society which can not only enhance their collective marketing strength but also make different milk products according to need of the consumers. 4. There are great-improved exports potential for milk products of western as well as traditional types.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, 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.	Yes, the Abstract is comprehensive. Abstract included the main points of the paper i.e. background, methods, purpose, results and conclusions of the study.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	subsections and structure of the paper is appropriate since it is covered Introduction, methodology, results and discussion, conclusion and references also. Note: Review of literature should be included in the manuscript.	
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.	The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound because: 1. Well structured. 2. Sample size is sufficient. 3. Results analysed by using statistical techniques. Work has revealed useful findings for the objectives stated for the study.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Sufficient but some recent research study should be incorporated.	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes, the language of the article is suitable.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is well structured and systematic. I appreciate the efforts of the Author.	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	C.K. Goyal
Department, University & Country	Devi Ahilya University, India