

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? (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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes yes yes yes yes	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language has to be checked ..grammatical mistakes have to be avoided	
Optional/General comments	The work carried out on Comparative Analysis of Chickpea: FPO and Non FPO Members in Banda District of Bundelkhand Region is very appreciative. Introduction – This section been well presented with recent reviews Materials and methods – methodology of selection has to clearly mentioned Results and discussions – the results and discussion has to be quoted with some more reviews supporting the paper or against the paper Reference style in accordance with the Journal guidelines may be followed Chand and Hegde is no where found in the article written. They may be included wherever necessary or may be deleted There are minor mistakes mentioned in the draft please carry out	

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:	Irugu Shakuntala Devi
Department, University & Country	Professor Jayashankar Telangana State Agricultural University, India