

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_95286
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of resource use efficiency and constraints of cotton production in Odisha
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 (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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p><b>Abstract:</b></p> <p><b>-Lines 16-18 (Cancelled lines):</b> These extra details are not needed in the abstract since they will be detailed or explained in the methodology section. The abstract being a summary of the whole work must be as succinct and concise as much as possible.</p> <p><b>-Lines 18-20:</b> I humbly suggest the author rephrase or reconstruct these lines for clarity. The said finding is not clear (i.e., ambiguous). It could be broken down into two sentences for conciseness.</p> <p><b>-Line 19:</b> Does the author mean to say "statistically significant" for small scale farmers and manure .....</p> <p><b>Keywords:</b> Authors can exhaust the number of keywords by stating at least 5 keywords to give the paper more audience. The keywords must not be repetitive from some words in the title, unless deemed very necessary.</p> <p><b>Keywords:</b> Authors can exhaust the number of keywords by stating at least 5 keywords to give the paper more audience. The keywords must not be repetitive from some words in the title, unless deemed very necessary.</p> <p><b>Introduction:</b></p> <p>-Authors could briefly integrate research progress (works done so far or what's known about the topic and what's unknown but important to be studied that is currently driving the study's objectives or main aim) in the introductory section. They could briefly highlight some major constraints among other key parameters, reported in other studies conducted elsewhere which could be compared to the results of this study in the discussion section. Such linkages are key or important for consistency's sake.</p> <p>-Again, they can integrate the importance of the outcome of this study to industrial players in the introduction.</p> <p>-Author (s) failed to state clearly what this study attempted to achieve/address (i.e., objectives/main aim) in the last paragraph of the introduction.</p> <p><b>Materials and methods:</b></p> <p>-Kindly use the Math function/Type or insert equational tab to type all equations, please.</p> <p>-Authors failed to briefly talk about the sample size for the 120 farmers, how they were selected and justification of the said number in being representative or drawing general conclusions. Again, How did authors deal with bias judgements looking at how subjective this approach is.</p> <p><b>Conclusion:</b></p> <p>-Kindly integrate the study's importance/significance in the concluding section.</p> <p>-What were some of the gaps or study limitations that could possibly guide future research? It needs to be included in the last paragraph of the concluding section.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>Some moderate to major grammatical defects were detected throughout the manuscript. Few were corrected. I humbly suggest the authors check the manuscript thoroughly to improve the proficiency level of the paper.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript generally informative and could impact policy or has an application value. However, I humbly suggest the authors consider the comments raised carefully to improve the manuscript.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Isaac Sarfo</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Research Institute for History of Science and Technology, Nanjing University of Information Science and Technology, China</b>