

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_96293
Title of the Manuscript:	Is there a variation in the Total Factor Productivity of Groundnuts? A One-Factor ANOVA Analysis of Andhra 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.journalsajsse.com/index.php/SAJSSE/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)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Paper is less scientific 2. Title is just fine 3. Abstract is sufficient 4. Structure and subsections are appropriate 5. Look at point 1 above 6. References are sufficient and recent 	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	OK	
Optional/General comments	The proposed paper is less scientific and just gives sort statistical inferences, it is then necessary to look all over again on analyses because conclusions made are just contrived interpretation and not based on the statistical analyses.	

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:	Sutanto Soehodho
Department, University & Country	University of Indonesia, Indonesia