

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_104025
Title of the Manuscript:	Export status of Fruits and Vegetables from India: An overview
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>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> 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 paper is important for scientific community but need to improve in terms of clear contribution of study. Too general discussion and unclear objectives. Need to be specific.</p> <p>Title of article is suitable based on the context</p> <p>Abstract - State the contribution of study</p> <p>Introduction - Limited research is presented moderately relevant and will make a nominal contribution to the field. Need some figures or statistics to support the study. Sound work which expresses a coherent position only in broad terms and in uncritical conformity to one or more standard views of the topic.</p> <p>LR - Adequate knowledge of the relevant literature is missing. Shortcomings in the interpretation and application of the literature. Evidence of a satisfactory knowledge and limited critical review of the relevant literature. Some attempt to construct a coherent argument, but may suffer loss of focus and consistency, with issues at stake stated only vaguely, or theoretical mode(s) couched in simplistic terms. Overall, Literature review part need to be improved.</p> <p>Methodology / Data Analysis - Arguments presented have flaws. There is some weakness in interpretation. Demonstrates an above average ability to articulate a critical response and an above average analysis of material. Inadequate coherence reflects a lack of insight and understanding. Demonstrates adequate levels of understanding and originality in the analysis of the research findings. There is limited evidence of personal insights into the field.</p> <p>Conclusion - The conclusions are partially logical and/or valid. They are communicated clearly. The final summary only partially communicates the purpose and findings of the study.</p> <p>Limitations and future directions are not discussed</p> <p>References - Referencing is not in line with the standard conventions in terms of format and layout</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Clear and correct use of English characterized by a very lucid style of expression, with no imprecise and/or incorrect statements. A simple basic style but with significant deficiencies in expression or format that may pose obstacles for the reader. Suggested to proofread before submission</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The academic standard of the paper is satisfactory a just pass mark. The work, however, is in need of serious editing. The writing style and layout of the article requires attention. There are omissions and linguistic and typographical errors. Editing and revision would improve the work and errors should definitely be rectified</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Naresh Sachdev
Department, University & Country	PCTE Group of Institutes, India