

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_96030
Title of the Manuscript:	Trends and Market integration of Kharif Sorghum in Beed district of Maharashtra
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)	The manuscript will be important to scientific community if the author improves it substantially. Title is okay The abstract is deficient in most of the requirements, therefore, it is non-comprehensive. Subsections and structure is appropriate. However, a lot of improvement is required here. The manuscript will be scientifically correct if suggested comments are used to improve the manuscript. References listed are not cited in the text. The text has only one citation. The whole manuscript must be thoroughly improved with the suggestions listed to make it better for publishing. This work should not be published in its current form.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Check grammar and avoid repeating sentences.	
Optional/General comments		

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Peter Oyier Ogweno
Department, University & Country	Rongo University, Kenya