

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_96776
Title of the Manuscript:	Services rendered by various marketing agencies to the banana grower in Burhanpur district of Madhya Pradesh
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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The title and area of study has significant contribution to scientific community, but the paper must be supported with theoretical literature review, that help to analyses and make connection between empirical data evidence to define or advance a theoretical position.</p> <p>There are lot of extension approaches frame work, which might support his/her finding.</p> <p>Yes, but the Abstract has missing rational statement.</p> <p>The writer should first write a rational background, then follow this with what are the open questions of his study (which he did this part), and identify the gaps in the literature and emphasise why it is important to address those gaps.</p> <p>Need more to be supported with theoretical literature farm work, and/ or literature review. Buts has good approach in selection of methodology</p> <p>The reference is away older in years of study, would be much supportive if the latest one included.</p> <p>The references are not sufficient enough and are not the most recent ones. From the references mentioned the only most recent one is 2020, which leaves behind 3 years., there might be some research work carried in same thematic areas during these years. Therefore, I would recommend if the research supported with more and most recent references. 2021 ,2022</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Accept with minor correction suggested 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)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ayano Kahano
Department, University & Country	Arba Minch University, Ethiopia