

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_93619
Title of the Manuscript:	Socio-Economical Profile and its Correlation with Entrepreneurial Behaviour of Vegetable Growers in Varanasi District of Uttar Pradesh
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:

(<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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>1. Abstract</b> This needs to be rewritten. Poor language and structure</p> <p><b>Introduction (objectives)</b> Methods Results Implication Conclusion These broad areas should help</p> <p><b>2. Introduction</b> The problem statement/research question is not clear No sufficient background information to introduce the problem What has literature said about behavior of farmers output? Especially in the research area Has there been interventions? What are the outcomes? Current state of vegetable output. Provide relevant citations</p> <p><b>3. Methodology</b> Describe the study area indicating why it was selected for this study</p> <p><b>4. Results/discussion</b> Since results and discussion are together. It is better to do the presentation under headings. Basically, discuss under each major finding or result. A minimum of three major headings Research questions were not clearly stated hence difficult to follow (refer to Introduction). These questions can even be the headings for the results and discussions</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Use appropriate tables for presentation	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Poor organization and structure Subpar technical language	

### 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

**Review Form 1.6**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Emmanuel Kombiok</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Energy and Natural Resources, Ghana</b>