## Review Form 1.7

| | |
|---|---|
| Journal Name: | **Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology** |
| Manuscript Number: | **Ms_AJAEES_96671** |
| Title of the Manuscript: | **Performance of Agri-warehousing in India** |
| 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<br><br>**1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?**<br>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)<br><br>**2. Is the title of the article suitable?**<br>(If not please suggest an alternative title)<br><br>**3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?**<br><br>**4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?**<br><br>**5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?**<br><br>**6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.**<br>**(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)** | Actually, this is not a scientific research article and it is being a review article, as data were collected from secondary sources.<br><br>No, this title should be changed to "Present scenarios of warehouse development in India."<br><br>No, it is very complicated. It should be written simply and clearly enough for the reviewer to understand. All numerical data should be divided and strategically written.<br><br>He or she should refer to the other reputed scientific article and follow the same procedures.<br><br>No, in, material and methods parts, no clear ideas are expressed. The data collection method should be clearly defined. As a result, it does not appear to be a scientific manuscript. Also, English grammar should be corrected for the top scientific reviewers.<br><br>There are no citations in the discussion section.<br>As a result, more citations from other related research articles are required. | |
| **Minor** REVISION comments<br>**1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?** | No, it should be completely corrected. | |
| **Optional/General** comments | . Corrections and comments should be sent to the writer as mentioned above. | |

**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?** | *(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* | |

**Reviewer Details:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Name: | **Mohideen Pichai Mohamed Irshath** |
| Department, University & Country | **South Eastern University of Sri Lanka, Sri Lanka** |