



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_29405
Title of the Manuscript:	A Study on Comparative Economics of Grain and Seed Production of Groundnut in Karnataka, India
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Manuscript concerns an important problem related with the analyze the economics of groundnut seed production and to specify the factors that are discriminating the seed production from grain production. Data collected for 100 farmers were used in this study for Tabular analysis and discriminant function analysis. Abstract is clear, informative, brief and representative of the work and underlines the significance of the subject. Introduction is understandable, clear and comprehensive exposing the reader to the topic. Purpose and objectives are scientifically appropriate. In "Introduction" are cited 18 authors. This is sufficiently. The methods used are aqurate and correctly described. So described they allow experiment to be reproduced. Appropriate statistics was used. The findings are particularly valuable having in a mind importance of the crop studied.	Overwhelmed by your gracious remarks and soliciting your kind co-operation.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	However, some minor errors were noted: In"Introduction" : Line 39 – (FAOSTAT, 2016), Line 40 - (ICRISAT, 2016) and Line 47 - (IIOR, 2016) are missing in "References". I think that must be given their Internet addresses. In "Results and discussion" part Discussion is missing. This part of the article should be strengthened. Tables are presented well.	Details of line 39, 40 and 47 have been included in reference section. Re-visited the discussion section, finding have been elaborated and compared the results with other published work.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Organization into sections and subsections was well done and paper structure is clear and arranged according to journal style.	Overwhelmed by your gracious remarks and soliciting your kind co-operation.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	The proposed peer review manuscript, titled "A Study on Comparative Economics of Grain and Seed Production of Groundnut in Karnataka, India" is of interest and it deserves to be published in the American Journal of Experimental Agriculture after minor corrections.	
--	--	--