

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJAEES_98314 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Comparative Analysis of Chickpea: FPO and Non FPO Members in Banda District of Bundelkhand Region |
| 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) |
|---|--|---|
| Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?yes (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable?yes (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?yes 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?yes 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? yes, after making corrections according to notes 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. need more references (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments) | 1.The present investigation concluded that the cost of cultivation of respondents who were not the member of any FPO was higher as compared to the cost of cultivation of respondents who were a member of an FPO. 2. The aim of the study should be placed at the end of the introduction 3. I think that the discussion needs more explanations of the result obtained and to compare with previous studies. 4. Based on the conclusions of the research, the authors need to add a description of suggestions and added value for other researchers or readers 5. It would be better to cite more recent article in close fields. | |
| Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | | |
| Optional/General comments | | |

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> | |

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name: | Dhia Ahmed Taain |
| Department, University & Country | College of Agriculture, University of Basrah, Iraq |