

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_98584
Title of the Manuscript:	Economics of Coconut Cultivation using treated sago industrial wastewater and fresh water in Salem district of Tamil Nadu
Type of the Article	Original research

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The topic of the research is practical and contemporary The whole document needs proofreading and editing The abstract is clear. It reflects the paper's content and intended Objective. Keywords are good The introduction and background are adequate and are validated with relevant reported research. Proofreading is needed [see attached scanned Manuscript] Methodology representation is adequate. Though needs to add to the Data analysis details and their measurement as descriptive statistics [see suggestion] The results are fine in their Table form but need some suggested changes as suggested. The discussion is adequate, nevertheless, is not validated by the reported literature for comparison purposes. The conclusion and recommendations are adequate Review carefully the write-up of the references for consistency and completeness, and to match the Journal's requirements. Make sure to add all suggested references to support the concepts presented throughout the paper Proofreading and editing are needed</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 		
<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 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hussin Jose Hejase
Department, University & Country	Al Maaref University, Lebanon