

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	YES, BUT THE AUTHOR NEEDS TO GIVE MORE EMPHASIS TO MARKETING ISSUES IN THE INTRODUCTION, RATHER THAN THE CULTIVATION PRACTICES OF BANANA. NO! SERVICES RENDERED BY MARKETING AGENCIES TO THE BANANA GROWERS IN BURHANPUR DISTRICT MADHYA PRADESH, INDIA NO SCANTY AND INADEQUATE NOT QUITE NOT sufficient The AUTHOR NEEDS TO REWORK THE MANUSCRIPT GENERALLY. A standard article is expected to be between 12 – 15 pages. Delete red colour portion of the article and add the blue words/phrases as identified by the reviewer.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Satisfactory	
Optional/General comments	REWORK GENERALLY THE MANUSCRIPT TO MAKE IT MORE STANDARD, BY RE-DOING THE INTRODUCTION, ABSTRACT AND MAIN BODY, INCLUDING THE REFERENCES.	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Salisu Audu Baba
Department, University & Country	School of Undergraduate, College of Education, Nigeria