

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_98161
Title of the Manuscript:	Market Share of the Paddy Seed in Bhoodan Pochampally Market and Surrounding Areas of Yadadri Bhuvangiri District in Telangana
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 REVISION comments</b> <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. It can be said that the article is important for the scientific community. 2. The title of the article is appropriate. 3. The abstract of the article is not comprehensive enough. 4. Subsections and structure of the article are not appropriate, they should be arranged in accordance with scientific rules. 5. The article is not scientifically correct. 6. References are insufficient. In the abstract section, the subject and importance of the study are briefly stated. The historical development of the study subject can be given in the introduction. That's why the same sentence is used in the introduction. In this section, the results of the study should be given more carefully. The introductory part is insufficient. The subject and scope of the study should be explained in detail by giving examples from previous studies. Theoretical and field studies on market share practices should be utilized. There are qualified articles on this subject in your journal. The material method section is very inadequate. It should be rewritten based on scientific rules. Tables 3 and 4 are not required. Findings section is given irregularly, it should be rewritten. Metric numbers should be written in accordance with the rules. I rearranged Table 6, this format should be used. The conclusion section is insufficient. It must be rewritten. References should be written in accordance with the rules. The places I painted yellow should be reviewed.	
<b>Minor REVISION comments</b> <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>		
<b>Optional/General comments</b>		

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

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ismail Ukav</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Adiyaman University, Turkey</b>