

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_104913
Title of the Manuscript:	A Study on Consumer Knowledge, Attitude and Preference towards Safe foods among Consumers of Coimbatore City
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1.Yes</p> <p>2. It's better to avoid "A Study" and reframe, e.g., the effect of knowledge on attitude and preference for safe food among the consumers of Coimbatore. Please check.</p> <p>3.Yes, study type is better to check, and it is better to add in methodology. "Mann-Whitney U-Test" repeated many times. Duration: how many years would be better to add?</p> <p>4.Yes, but it would be better to add the discussion under a separate heading. Discussion is lacking. It's better to remove 3.1.2 and 3.1.3. Put 3 for results and 4 for discussion.</p> <p>5.Yes correct</p> <p>6.References not cited in the text: one or two references are not in proper format. It is better to add or remove doi for all references.</p> <p>Others:</p> <p>Keywords are better to be in MeSH terms, in alphabetical order, and not in the title.</p> <p>A sample size calculation is needed.</p> <p>It is better to mention the type of study clearly.</p> <p>For the diagram footnote needed, some tables don't have subheadings.</p> <p>Questionnaire who prepared, and any references available better to mention and standradization needed.</p> <p>Introduction better to cut short.</p> <p>Only quality mark checking was analyzed. For other questions?</p>	
	Compare with similar studies.	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	no	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rakesh Kotha
Department, University & Country	Niloufer Hospital, India