



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_55469
Title of the Manuscript:	"Effect of Agrochemical use in vegetable production: A situational study in a village of Comilla district."
Type of the 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)																																																												
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>“Effect of Agrochemical use in vegetable production: A situational study in a village of Comilla district.”</p> <p>Abstract “Lack of awareness was a great problem in this village. So in order to increase awareness training is very much essential. It was a social research but scientific research is essential in this village.” This conclusion is confuse. I suggest: “There is no awareness of the harmful effects of pesticides. Thus, it is necessary to instruct farmers.” Key words: need to be in the norms http://decs.bvs.br/cgi-bin/wxis1660.exe/decserver/?IisScript=../cgi-bin/decserver/decserver.xis&interface_language=p&previous_page=homepage&previous_task=NULL&task=start</p> <p>Background/Statement of the problem I suggest unite the objectives in a single sentence “Moreover, there are several numbers of specific objectives. These are: 1. To describe the current status of pesticide use in Joshpur village of Comilla district. 2. To identify the knowledge level of farmers about health hazard due to pesticide use.”</p> <p>Results and discussions 1 -I suggest putting the average age of respondents and standard deviation: “Maximum 45% and 32.5% respondents were middle and old aged” 2 -I suggest - In the farms, 90% of the farmers were involved in agriculture (vegetable), 3% of the farmers were involved in business 7% farmers were involved in service. “Maximum 90% of the farmers were involved in agriculture (vegetable), 3% of the farmers were involved in business 7% farmers were involved in service” 3- remove the word Maximum because is confuse “Maximum 50% respondents had involvement in agriculture above 20 years”, “Maximum number of respondents 47.5% respondents used local seed, 37.5% farmers use both local and hi yielding seed and 15% farmers use only Hi-yielding seed. It is noticed that 80% farmers sell vegetable in local market and 20% farmers sell vegetable in both local market and traders. Majority 80% respondents sold vegetables in local market and 20% respondents sold vegetables both in local markets and traders” 4- What this IPM? 5- The norm to table is wrong. Table is not close in lateral. Table 1 : Types of vegetable cultivation:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="756 1270 1825 1892"> <thead> <tr> <th>Cultivated vegetables by the respondents</th> <th>No of respondents</th> <th>% of the respondents</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Potato</td><td>1</td><td>2.50%</td></tr> <tr><td>Tomato and Brinjal</td><td>1</td><td>2.50%</td></tr> <tr><td>Tomato,Brinjal,Potato and bean</td><td>5</td><td>12.50%</td></tr> <tr><td>Tomato,brinjal,potato,bean and sweetgourd</td><td>8</td><td>20%</td></tr> <tr><td>Tomato,Brinjal,potato,bean,sweetgourd,other</td><td>4</td><td>10%</td></tr> <tr><td>Tomato,brinjal,potato,bean and others</td><td>3</td><td>7.50%</td></tr> <tr><td>Tomato,Brinjal,Potato and sweetgourd</td><td>1</td><td>2.50%</td></tr> <tr><td>Tomato,Brinjal,bean</td><td>1</td><td>2.50%</td></tr> <tr><td>Tomato,brinjal,bean and sweetgourd</td><td>2</td><td>5%</td></tr> <tr><td>Tomato,brinjal and others</td><td>1</td><td>2.50%</td></tr> <tr><td>Tomato and potato</td><td>2</td><td>5%</td></tr> <tr><td>Tomato,potato and bean</td><td>2</td><td>5%</td></tr> <tr><td>Tomato,potato,bean and sweetgourd</td><td>1</td><td>2.50%</td></tr> <tr><td>Tomato,potato,bean and others</td><td>1</td><td>2.50%</td></tr> <tr><td>Tomato,potato and sweetgourd</td><td>1</td><td>2.50%</td></tr> <tr><td>Tomato,potato and others</td><td>1</td><td>2.50%</td></tr> <tr><td>Tomato and others</td><td>1</td><td>2.50%</td></tr> <tr><td>Potato,bean and others</td><td>1</td><td>2.50%</td></tr> <tr><td>potato and sweetgourd</td><td>1</td><td>2.50%</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Cultivated vegetables by the respondents	No of respondents	% of the respondents	Potato	1	2.50%	Tomato and Brinjal	1	2.50%	Tomato,Brinjal,Potato and bean	5	12.50%	Tomato,brinjal,potato,bean and sweetgourd	8	20%	Tomato,Brinjal,potato,bean,sweetgourd,other	4	10%	Tomato,brinjal,potato,bean and others	3	7.50%	Tomato,Brinjal,Potato and sweetgourd	1	2.50%	Tomato,Brinjal,bean	1	2.50%	Tomato,brinjal,bean and sweetgourd	2	5%	Tomato,brinjal and others	1	2.50%	Tomato and potato	2	5%	Tomato,potato and bean	2	5%	Tomato,potato,bean and sweetgourd	1	2.50%	Tomato,potato,bean and others	1	2.50%	Tomato,potato and sweetgourd	1	2.50%	Tomato,potato and others	1	2.50%	Tomato and others	1	2.50%	Potato,bean and others	1	2.50%	potato and sweetgourd	1	2.50%	
Cultivated vegetables by the respondents	No of respondents	% of the respondents																																																												
Potato	1	2.50%																																																												
Tomato and Brinjal	1	2.50%																																																												
Tomato,Brinjal,Potato and bean	5	12.50%																																																												
Tomato,brinjal,potato,bean and sweetgourd	8	20%																																																												
Tomato,Brinjal,potato,bean,sweetgourd,other	4	10%																																																												
Tomato,brinjal,potato,bean and others	3	7.50%																																																												
Tomato,Brinjal,Potato and sweetgourd	1	2.50%																																																												
Tomato,Brinjal,bean	1	2.50%																																																												
Tomato,brinjal,bean and sweetgourd	2	5%																																																												
Tomato,brinjal and others	1	2.50%																																																												
Tomato and potato	2	5%																																																												
Tomato,potato and bean	2	5%																																																												
Tomato,potato,bean and sweetgourd	1	2.50%																																																												
Tomato,potato,bean and others	1	2.50%																																																												
Tomato,potato and sweetgourd	1	2.50%																																																												
Tomato,potato and others	1	2.50%																																																												
Tomato and others	1	2.50%																																																												
Potato,bean and others	1	2.50%																																																												
potato and sweetgourd	1	2.50%																																																												



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>potato,others</td> <td>1</td> <td>2.50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bean and sweetgourd</td> <td>1</td> <td>2.50%</td> </tr> </table>	potato,others	1	2.50%	Bean and sweetgourd	1	2.50%	
potato,others	1	2.50%						
Bean and sweetgourd	1	2.50%						
	<p>6- The text has many figures. 7- The text don't argues with the others papers. The author need compare the results with the others authors.</p>							
Minor REVISION comments								
Optional/General comments								

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?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>The text does not write about the term ethics committee. Whether this was approved by a committee or not.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Regiane Cristina do Amaral
Department, University & Country	University of Sergipe, Brazil