

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_95293
Title of the Manuscript:	An Analysis of the Agrochemicals Industry in SPSR Nellore District of Andhra Pradesh
Type of the Article	Short 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. It can be said that the article is important for the scientific community.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is appropriate.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive enough.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the article are not arranged properly.</p> <p>5. The article should be studied scientifically.</p> <p>6. References are insufficient Instead of Southwest monsoon, Northwest monsoon keywords, more appropriate ones should be chosen.</p> <p>In the introduction, information should be given about the importance, scope and purpose of the subject. Previous studies on the subject should be mentioned. The values given in dollar terms in the introduction should be reviewed.</p> <p>In the Research Methodology section, information should be given about the method and the sample. Details about the Henry Garrett ranking Technique should be given in the Analytical Tools section. There are errors in the percentage values in the results and discussion section, they should be corrected. Tables should be referenced for values. Separate analyzes should be performed for each table. The conclusion section should be rewritten to cover all the results of the study, and suggestions should be made.</p> <p>In the study, adequate resources were not used and citation rules were not followed. Explanations of abbreviations such as SSC, CAGR should be given. The places I painted yellow should be reviewed.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

### 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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

## Review Form 1.7

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Ismail Ukav</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Adiyaman University, Turkey</b>