



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International</a> |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_JGEESI_48174   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | A STUDY ON THE PRODUCTIVITY OF POTATO IN HUGLI DISTRICT, WEST BENGAL              |
| 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) |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments | <p>In introduction: You have explained the background of your study well, especially those related to spatial-temporal variation. However, you have not explained what is related to inter-block variability. Also note writing words with uppercase letters and typos.</p> <p><b>In Results and discussions:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. You did not mention the CAGR size in the research method but wrote it down on the results of the study? Is this related to the purpose of your study?</li> <li>2. You only mention indexes of instability, sustainability, production and productivity, but why don't you directly compare them in one table so that the discussion will be more assertive. You only mention the index number but it doesn't explain why it happened.</li> </ol> <p><b>In conclusion:</b><br/>You have not answered the overall research objectives. In fact, you make conclusions that are not your research objective, namely some other factors like urbanization, cost of production, infrastructure facilities, post-harvest market price, farmers' preferences and profitability of the crop and government policies that are influenced by the crop productivity of potato in the area. You did not discuss this in the results of the study.</p> | All corrections and modification done accordingly   |
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments      | <p><b>In abstract: you should mention the results clearly.</b><br/>In study area: What is CD Blocks?</p>   |   |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments    | In materials and methods: You have already stated a number of measures (indices and coefficients) that have been done by other researchers, but you have not explained which one is the best, including what you have used in your study.  |   |

**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? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> |   |