

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_94972
Title of the Manuscript:	Economics, Marketing and Storage of onion cultivation in Yamunanagar, Haryana
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:

(<https://www.journalajaees.com/index.php/AJAEES/editorial-policy>)

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>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes it is, the manuscript has a beautiful idea that will benefit the scientific community.</p> <p>No, The topic can be rephrased as "Economic and Marketing Analysis of Onion Production in Haryana, India"</p> <p>No, it is not detailed. It did not include aim of the study, study design, methodology and conclusion.</p> <p>Yes, but needs to be reworked.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No, because out of all the 19 references cited, only 2-3 are somewhat recent while others are old.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes to some extent, the paper just need a little editing.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Introduction: The statement of problem is not clearly defined and the objectives of the study were not stated.</p> <p>Methodology: The methodology is poorly written – no specifications of how the samples were selected and the sampling technique. The unit of the study was not specified either farmer or household. The analytical tools were hanging, the study didn't show what each was evaluating.</p> <p>Results and Discussion: only the result were stated but not backed up by an explanation of why?</p> <p>Conclusion: should be reworked to include policy recommendations from study.</p> <p>References: needs to be updated and revised.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Oluwaremilekun Ayobami Adebisi
Department, University & Country	Centre for Sustainable Agricultural Empowerment, Nigeria