

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_94999
Title of the Manuscript:	Market Integration and Price Transmission Analysis of Onion in Wholesale Markets of 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:

(<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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. I consider the paper relevant to the scientific community in the area of knowledge to which it is directed. The statistical work appears to be very well structured.</p> <p>2. The title is succinct and appropriate.</p> <p>3. The abstract meets the expectation of the paper.</p> <p>4. The subsections explain the description of the paper well.</p> <p>5. The proposal of the paper is interesting for the proposed area of study.</p> <p>6. The references are well out of date, not demonstrating the state-of-the-art of the researched topic. I suggest updating the references, for a maximum of publications of up to 5 years.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	The language meets the expectation.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dacyr Dante de Oliveira Gatto
Department, University & Country	UNINOVE- Universidade Nove de Julho, Brazil